

THE
Eclectic Review.

M A Y, 1854.

ART. I.—*On the Plurality of Worlds.* An Essay. London :
John W. Parker and Son.

THIS is a remarkable production—in many points the most suggestive book we have read for a long period. It is a singular combination of the results of intuition and of logic, of physical deduction, and of poetic thought. We have found in it few leading ideas which we had not previously entertained and expressed ; but those thoughts which came to us as intuitions are here based on a foundation of rigid thought and overwhelming fact.

There is nothing more interesting than to watch the singular revolutions and returning circuits of human thought—to notice how a theory passes current for centuries—is at length assailed, exposed, and thought to be exploded ; and yet, wait another century or so, and it reappears, and is found after all to be true. It has been so with many mathematical, moral, metaphysical, and theological doctrines. Even alchemy and astrology, which had been treated for two hundred years as mere insanities, have now their votaries ; at least there are those, and very intellectual persons too, who think that great truths lie disguised under the strange terminology and dreamy mysticism of those two occult sciences. And so with the doctrine of a plurality of worlds. It was the general opinion till nearly the end of the seventeenth century, that our earth was the only part of the

universe (except, of course, the worlds beyond the grave) inhabited. Two years before the revolution which placed William of Orange on the British throne—Bernard le Bovier de Fontenelle began a revolution of another kind, by the publication of his ‘*Entretiens sur la Pluralité des Mondes*.’ This writer, although now almost forgotten, was a man of much mark and likelihood in his day. A nephew of the great dramatic poet, Corneille, a man of pure life and amiable disposition, distinguished by almost universal acquirements, possessing a poetic vein of considerable grace and felicity, and a knowledge of mathematics, legislation, metaphysics, statesmanship, belles-lettres, and astronomy, he added to all this an elegant and witty mode of composition, which completely fascinated his contemporaries. He lived to the prodigious age of one hundred; but amid all his writings, poetical, dramatic, critical, and fictitious, the only one that continued popular after his death, or that can still be said to be in the faintest degree alive, is that ‘*Sur la Pluralité des Mondes*.’ Its thought is far from being profound; its language seldom copes adequately with the sublimities of the subject, and its information of course is imperfect. But the ingenuity of the reasoning, the novelty of the theme, the playfulness of the fancy, and the graces of the style, combine to render it a piece of delightful reading. It was one of the first, and continues one of the best attempts to translate science into popular language, to bring it down to popular capacity, and to surround it with literary charms. Fontenelle was not a great original genius; but he was a dexterous and brilliant interpreter of the intuitions and conclusions of higher poetic and philosophic minds. He had read Newton, and his work formed a pleasant dilution of some of the principal deductions from Newton’s theories and demonstrations, and was garnished besides with many flowers, culled by ingenious fancy rather than by powerful imagination. The book ran like wildfire, it was translated into various languages, and wherever it came, it seemed to widen the horizon of human thought, and to substitute feelings of sympathy and interest in the heavenly orbs, for that superstitious terror and mystic reverence with which men had hitherto regarded them. We shall never forget the emotions with which having read it, in a very imperfect English version, at the age of eleven, we went out and saw the stars shining down over our native valley, or pausing on the tops of the magnificent mountains which girdle it in, a new light, and felt or fancied, as Fontenelle seemed to have proved, that they were worlds like our own, abodes of life and intelligence, scenes of trial and probation, arenas of contest and altars of worship. What though the splendid visions of astro-

logy had fled before the light of science—what, although, to use the beautiful words we had even then read—

‘The intelligible forms of ancient poets,
The fair humanities of old religion,
The power, the beauty, and the majesty
That had their haunts in dale or piny mountains
Or forest, by slow stream or pebbly spring,
Or chasms and watery depths; all these had vanished,
And lived no longer in the faith of reason’—

Science seemed to have revealed in exchange realities yet lovelier than these abandoned dreams; new, rich, populous islands in that skyey deep, where we had thought that all was barren and vacant; mightier earths rolling round larger suns, and looking up to more glorious constellations; galleries of worlds rising and brightening as they rose, above each other, and all turning toward some unseen centre or core; inhabitants of every variety of shape and size and intellectual development, swarming in every planet, if not also colonizing the proud suns of the system themselves; everywhere bustle, progress, and animation, even in those orbs which at night had seemed the very metaphors of silence, solemnity, and death. Thus the stars began to glitter and sparkle to our eye as if a tide of fresh light had been suddenly poured across them, and as if from being silent they had begun to speak and their speech was poetry. And it was strange to feel how the heavens had been at once pushed farther off and brought nearer by the force of these speculations. While they no longer seemed to rest on the mountain tops, nor their stars at times to drop down upon the earth, but to stretch away in long file and multitudinous procession toward the Infinite, yet the knowledge that they had probably inhabitants not dissimilar to ourselves in bodily structure and in mental powers, shed a certain home-charm upon objects which had formerly seemed as much ‘strangers’ as they were ‘pilgrims’ in their perpetual progress through the midnight sky. These now shone upon us through an atmosphere which made them assume the aspect of lamps in upper rooms connected with a dwelling of which we occupied the ground floor, and we eyed them with this feeling: ‘We shall be hereafter up among your splendours, and shall, as brethren, mingle with your bright inhabitants.’

This youthful, and, on the whole, innocent Nature-worship, was greatly strengthened, not only in our individual case, but in that of thousands and of the public generally, by the appearance of Chalmers’s ‘Astronomical Discourses.’ More than perhaps any one book, except ‘Uncle Tom’s Cabin,’ more certainly than any

volume of sermons ever published, it electrified the reading world. It was found in every parlour and boudoir, in every steam-boat and track-boat, in the literary man's study, and in the weaver's shop, here surmounting a pile of old theologians in the chamber of the divine, and there peeping out timorously and half sunk amid paints, boxes, brushes, and sketches in the artist's studio. It seemed a combination of the theological treatise and the fairy tale. It led religion forth from her secret chamber with the timbrels and dances of fancy. It took up Fontenelle's views, it annexed to them the more recent and wonderful discoveries in the science of the stars, and it surrounded them with the powers of a far more fertile imagination, with the energies of a much more vigorous intellect, and with the pomps of an eloquence incomparably more impassioned and sublime. Men gazed in wonder at the splendid although meteoric production, and many thought and said, 'Here at last truth religious, truth scientific, and the beauty of genius have met and embraced each other. Here is a bright bridge, for the first time uniting Earth and Heaven.' But alas! after this momentary madness of admiration had passed away, it was found that the bridge was only a rainbow, beautiful, evanescent, unreal, and which disappearing, left heaven and earth as far asunder as it had found them.

So, however, it did not for a season appear to the public; and the impression made by Chalmers was kept up and extended by the many admirable speculations on astronomy contained in the works of Dr. Dick, Professor Nichol, Isaac Taylor, Sir John Herschell, and others, all of whom, amid their diversities of view on other topics relating to the science, coincided in taking for granted that other worlds must be inhabited by intelligent beings. It is not more than ten years since, we, in unison, we have *since* had reason to believe, with other thinkers both at home and on the continent, began to suspect that the evidence for the plurality of worlds might not be so strong as had been supposed, and that *à priori* their being inhabited was not very likely. In proof that this long ago was our sentiment in *germ*, we shall take the liberty of quoting a few sentences written by us in 1844 and published to the world two years subsequently. 'Science may and does hope that each fair star has its own beautiful and happy race of immortal intelligences, but Science does not *know*. For aught Science knows, those suns and systems may be seen only by our eyes and our telescopes; for aught she knows, the Universe may only be *beginning* to be peopled, and earth have been *selected as the first spot for the great colonization*. The peopling of our own planet was a gradual process. Why may not the same be concluded of the Universe of

which our earth is a part? May not Earth, in this sense, be as an Eden to other regions of the All? Are appearance and analogy pleaded as proofs that the Universe is peopled throughout? Appearance and analogy here utter an uncertain sound; for are not all the suns, or what we may call the continents of Creation, seemingly burning masses uninhabitable by any beings we can even conceive of? Do not many of the planets or islands appear either too near or too remote from the central blaze to support animal existence? The moon, the only planet very near us, has manifestly not yet arrived at the state necessary for supporting living beings, and Science remembers that innumerable ages passed ere even our globe was fitted for receiving its present population, and that, according to the researches of geology, the earth rolled round the sun for ages, a vast and weltering wilderness. Here then, Science is totally silent, or utters only a faltering 'perhaps.' Is it said that, but for intelligent beings, space would be empty? How! empty if it be full of God? Shall you call a room empty because only one immortal being sits and meditates there? Is God not society sufficient for his own creation? Shall you call the Universe empty, if God be present in it, even though he were present alone?

It will appear hereafter that there are singular coincidences between the views thus propounded and those of the author before us. Not that we wish to charge him with plagiarism, for it is exceedingly improbable that he ever saw or heard of our humble lucubration; but we wish to point out the remarkable fact that two thinkers, standing in some respects at opposite poles, the one a non-scientific and the other a scientific man, have been borne along by independent currents to the same conclusion, a conclusion in which we believe both will be soon joined by many in whose minds already the thought is beginning more or less clearly to stir.

It may be partly, therefore, from a very natural gratification at finding a favourite theory of ours taken up and handled with the power of a master; but it is not *entirely* from this cause that, we repeat, we have seldom read a book with more delight and never one with a more thorough intuitive conviction, 'this is *all* true,' than the treatise at present on our table. We proceed, as a labour of love, first, to analyse its contents, and secondly, to supplement its statements by a few additional remarks.

We must confine ourselves to a bare outline of the argument, leaving our readers to acquaint themselves with the style and manner in their manly energy, clear precision, and philosophic calm, not unornamented by brief bursts of eloquence, and not undiversified by rapid gleams and rich cross-lights of poetry.

The author commences with stating the astronomical objection to religion to which Chalmers has attempted to reply, an objection which passed transiently through David's mind when he asked: 'When I consider the heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars which thou hast ordained. What is man, that thou art mindful of him? and the son of man that thou visitest him?' This objection seems to have been founded in the psalmist's view simply on a general impression of the vast distance, the multitude, and the unearthly splendour of the starry orbs when compared with the meanness, grossness, and density of the globe on which he was standing, and the consequent insignificance of man, whom he felt to be a mere mote upon his own planet. But the strength of this objection, our author shows, is greatly increased since David's time, by the discoveries of science, which he proceeds with much mastery and clearness to recount. The discoveries of the real shape of our globe—of its great inferiority to many of its neighbour planets in size—of its dependence on the Sun—of the innumerable fixed stars, being probably suns of equal or superior grandeur and magnitude to ours—of the telescopic stars in their multitudes—of the nebulae and their resolution, by Lord Rosse's telescope, into distinct points of light—of, in short, the prodigious dimensions of the material Universe, as well as the high probabilities supposed to be established in favour of the notion that many if not all of the planets are inhabited, have served vastly to increase the intensity of the idea of insignificance, in regard to our earth and its inhabitants, expressed by the old Hebrew words, 'What is man that thou art mindful of him, and the son of man that thou visitest him?'

In the second chapter he states at length the objection to religion which has been based on the current theories of astronomy, preferring, however, to look at it under the light of a difficulty felt by a friend to Christianity rather than as a stumbling-block thrown in its way by a foe. The statement is substantially this: 'I believe that God has made the world—made me a moral being—provided for, loved, and cared for me and for my race, and sent his only begotten and well-beloved Son to die for and deliver from a great moral calamity all who trust upon him. These are my cherished faiths; but when I look up to the heavens, and remember that this earth is only a unit amid endless millions of worlds containing moral beings, like, or different from, or superior to man, I am overwhelmed, I am confounded, and tempted to doubt whether God *has* in such a peculiar and transcendant manner interfered for me or my insect race.'

In the third chapter he considers one part of Dr. Chalmers's

reply to this objection. He does not enter on the consideration of his argument as a whole. We have elsewhere attempted to show, first, that Chalmers's logic, in his 'Astronomical Discourses,' is 'conveyed,' as Ancient Pistol has it, bodily from Andrew Fuller's 'Gospel its own Witness;' and, secondly, that it was not worth the trouble and toil of the conveyance, being weak and unsatisfactory, made up, on the whole, of assumptions and truisms. Our author, however, holds it in somewhat higher estimation, and invites especial notice to that portion of it which is based on the discoveries of the microscope, which is certainly the most original and beautifully developed thought in the volume. But what, asks he, after all, does it prove? That God can provide for innumerable worlds besides this, without being withdrawn, or distracted, or wearied in his operations in this earth, because the microscope proves that he is sustaining *animal* life, sustenance, and enjoyment, for innumerable more inhabitants of the earth than we were aware of. This reasoning might quiet the mind of one whom astronomical discoveries had led to doubt the ordinary doctrines of natural religion, and had given a LIMITED notion of the power and resources of the Great Supreme. But our author denies that these discoveries are calculated to start such a doubt as the microscope is brought in to answer—maintaining that, on the contrary, they are fitted to lead us, in themselves, to the belief that Divine Wisdom and Power are not only great, but great in a degree we cannot fathom or comprehend; that they are, to our apprehension, infinite, and to the infinite, *how* can you and *what* can the microscope add? Once you admit that God made the worlds, it follows, without any need of microscopic aid, that He *could* quite as easily have made animals to inhabit these worlds. Whether He has done so or not depends upon considerations altogether apart from microscopic discoveries, which show us indeed life revelling on earth, but say less than nothing as to whether it be likely that this is or is not the case in those orbs which shine

‘Beyond the solar path and milky way.’

‘If astronomy,’ he adds, ‘gives birth to scruples which interfere with religion, they must be found in some other quarter than in the possibility of mere animal life existing in other parts of the universe as well as on our earth. That possibility may require us to enlarge our idea of the Deity, but it has little or no tendency to disturb our apprehension of his attributes.’

In the fourth Chapter he gives a farther statement of the difficulty. Hitherto, he has been speaking upon the supposition of other worlds teeming only with brute, or reptile, or insect existence, and he finds little there that can create religious doubt,

or unsettle religious convictions. It does not even disturb the conclusions of Natural Religion, far less interfere with the principles and dogmata of Revealed. But if we admitted that these worlds were tenanted by intelligent, moral, and religious beings like man, the state of the question were entirely altered. For man is not only an intellectual, but a progressive, an historical, a moral, religious, spiritual creature, entirely and essentially distinct from, and superior to, the lower animals. Now here occurs a biforked difficulty. Is the earth alone the abode of such or similar beings, possessing a progressive, moral, and religious constitution, it being granted to be a mere speck and atom amid the vast array of material structures? Or are other regions in space peopled with beings who, like man, have a history, who, like him, have a moral sense, who, like him, are, in a manner, related to the divine nature, and entertain the prospect of a nearer relation still?

‘To extend such suppositions to other worlds would be a proceeding so arbitrary and fanciful that we are led to consider whether the alternative supposition may not be the more admissible—that is, that man is in an especial and eminent manner the object of God’s care; that his place in the creation is not that he merely occupies one among millions of similar domiciles, provided in boundless profusion by the Creator of the universe; but that he is the servant, subject, and child of God in a way unique and peculiar; that his being a spiritual creature makes him belong to a spiritual world, which is not to be judged of merely by analogies belonging to the material universe.’

Now here, as the author finds the choice embarrassing, he proceeds in the fifth Chapter to inquire if other sciences besides astronomy may not help him in determining it. Even granting that the other bodies in the universe are fitted, like the earth, to be the abodes of life, yet it would require a great deal of evidence to make us believe that they have inhabitants like ours, or that, though planets did revolve round the fixed stars as centres, that they were at all similar to our earth, and such evidence is altogether wanting. But may not geology furnish us with evidence *on the other side*? That it does he proceeds to show by such arguments as these: The earth has been in existence for innumerable ages; it was long untenanted, save by reptiles and brutes; successive acts of creative power introduced successive races of beings; man did not arrive till late, at the very farthest not more than 10,000 years ago; he was not the mere continuation and culmination of a long line of antecedent inferiors, but a being essentially distinct and ineffably superior, as his gift of language, his moral sense, his power of progression, his perception of general principles, and his recognition of his own divine origin sufficiently prove. It follows, therefore, that God does not look upon vast

tracts, whether of time or space, as utterly barren and vacant, because not peopled by man, that,—

‘If the earth, as the habitation of man, is a speck in the midst of an infinity of space, the earth, as the habitation of man, is also a speck at the end of an infinity of time; that if we are as nothing in the surrounding universe, we are as nothing in the elapsed eternity, or rather in the elapsed organic antiquity, during which the earth has existed and been the abode of life; that man has occupied but an atom of time, as he has occupied but an atom of space; that, as he is surrounded by myriads of globes which may, like this, be the habitations of living things, so he has been preceded on this earth, not possibly or probably only, but certainly, by myriads of generations of living things; and yet that, comparing his history with theirs, he certainly has been fitted to be the object of the care and guardianship, the favour and government of the Master and Governor of All in a manner entirely different from anything which it is possible to believe with regard to the countless generations of brute creatures which had gone before him.’

It will be observed that this argument accomplishes several objects at once. It proves man’s peculiar dignity and grandeur; it meets an objection to his insignificance in space by a proof of his importance in time (so that if the stars threaten to crush, the fossilized remains conspire to crown him), and it more than insinuates the probability that, if his destined abode remained empty of intelligent and moral beings for incomputable ages, it may be the same, as yet, with all other planets and systems, without detracting one atom from our conception of the power or the wisdom of the Most High. It adds force to this, farther, to remember that the greater part of earth even is still unpeopled; that the sea, so far as intelligent beings are concerned, is a howling wilderness; and that the interior of the planet, by far its largest portion, is probably vacant. But once grant man to be man, an intelligent, moral, religious, spiritual being, then ‘we can have no difficulty in believing, if the evidence directs us to believe, that that part of the creation in which he has his present appointed place is the special field of God’s care and love; by whatever wastes of space and multitudes of material bodies it may be surrounded, by whatever races it may have been previously occupied, of brutes that perish, and that, compared with man, can hardly be said to have lived.’

It might still be urged, ‘Your geological argument is very strong, but are not the analogies in astronomy conclusive against it?’ To this, then, the author proceeds to address himself, proposing to inquire ‘whether astronomy really does what is claimed for her; whether she carries us so securely to the bounds of the visible universe that our fancy may take up the task and people the space thus explored; whether the bodies which astronomy

has examined be really as fitted as our earth to sustain a population of living things; whether the most distant objects in the universe do really seem to be systems or the beginning of systems; whether astronomy herself may not incline in favour of the condition of man as being the sole creature of his kind.' He commences with the nebulae, 'the outskirts of creation.' Ever since 1846 the general opinion has been that all these curious cloudy scatterings, those spilt drops in ether, are collections of suns; but this conclusion our author controverts, if not with thorough success, certainly with great ingenuity and great boldness. To prove it possible that many of the unresolved nebulae are unresolvable, and that it is not distance alone which prevents the telescope from melting them into stars, he adduces the Magellanic clouds, in which two strange groups there are stars of various magnitudes, clusters of various forms, nebulae regular and irregular, nebulous tracts and patches of peculiar character, and all so disposed that the most distant of them, whichever these may be, are not more than one-tenth more distant than the nearest. In those regions of space there co-exist in a limited compass, and in indiscriminate position, stars, clusters of stars, nebulae, regular and irregular, and nebulous streaks and patches, such things as nebulae side by side with stars and clusters, nebulous matter resolvable occurring close to nebulous matter unresolvable, which seems to prove that these are different things in themselves, not merely different to us, and that whatever inference we may draw from the resolvability of the nebulae, we may not draw this that they are more distant and contain a larger array of systems and worlds in proportion as they are difficult to resolve. Nay, he proceeds to ask who shall say assuredly that the bright points into which the telescope resolves the nebulae are suns like ours; who shall tell how large they are, at what distances, of what structure, of what solidity, of what use? 'All that the telescope tells us is that the substance of nebulae is not continuous, but discrete, separable and separate into distinct luminous elements. But he were a bold man who should aver that each of these elements was a sun like ours, surrounded by planets, and each of these planets the seat of an animal and vegetable creation.' He then attempts to prove, by arguments drawn from the mechanical structure of the spiral nebulae, that they are mere confused, indiscriminate, incoherent masses. These arguments seem exceedingly ingenious, but we must refer our readers for them to the book itself.

He comes next to the fixed stars, and shows first from the gyratory motion of some of them that their substance is much less dense than that of our sun. Secondly, that planets revolving about or among a pair of suns which are at the same time revolving round each other, would form a scheme too complex and

impossible to be arranged in a stable manner. Thirdly, that in reference to single stars they resemble indeed the sun in giving light, but their inferior density, the extraordinary changes in colour through which many of them have passed, the fact that some of them have entirely disappeared, and the acceleration which takes place in the motion of others, combine in proving that they are not yet solid, but only solidifying, and not till this process is complete can they cast off planets. Some of them turn, indeed, like the sun, upon their axis, but that motion is not in him necessarily connected with his having near him the inhabited earth, and those orbs in which this phenomenon exists are unlike the sun in having one side darker than the other; there is no proof that the fixed stars have planets round them, and even though they had, there is less than none that these planets have gone through such changes as our earth, or have borne such a progeny as man. It is more likely that if they exist they are in the state of the moon. He alludes in the course of this chapter to an illustration of Fontenelle, who compares one who should deny that the stars and planets are inhabited, to a citizen of Paris, who, seeing from the towers of Notre Dame the town of St. Denis (it being supposed that no communication between the two places had ever existed), denies it is inhabited because he does not see the inhabitants. Our author, however, contends that the image is not fair, but should be modified by supposing rather that we inhabit an island from which innumerable other islands are visible, but the art of navigation being unknown, we are ignorant if any of them are inhabited. Whether they are or not, becomes a fair field for conjecture and inquiry. Various judgments will be formed according to various phenomena. But since we see that some of these islands appear to be barren rocks, and others clad in eternal ice, and others to be raging volcanoes, while ours, on the contrary, is a quiet, comfortable, temperate spot, occupied by a numerous race of moral and religious beings, the strong probability comes at last to be that it alone is as yet inhabited.

Chapter nine treats of the planets. He begins at the outermost point of the system—the planet Neptune. It is a very dark and a very cold world. The sun, as seen from thence, is reduced to ‘the *star of day*’—a *full Jupiter*. Still there might be animals in Neptune, with their vital scheme accommodated to the scanty supply of light and heat, if there were any general ground for assuming inhabitants. But in order to prove that there is none, he adduces the moon. This body lies nearest us. Its distance from the sun would admit of animal and vegetable life similar to ours. It has evidently been made for other purposes than merely to shed a glimmering uncertain ray upon our

midnights. It is within a distance which makes it susceptible of very close scrutiny. And yet all, or almost all, grant that it is not inhabited. The conclusion is, therefore, since of the two bodies of the solar system which alone we can examine so closely as to know anything about them—the earth and the moon—if the one be inhabited and the other not, we have then no right to assume at once that any other body in the solar system belongs to the former of these classes rather than the latter. If, even under terrestrial conditions of light and heat, we have a total absence of the phenomenon of life, known to us only as a terrestrial phenomenon, we are assuredly not entitled to assume that when these conditions fail we have still the phenomenon—life. But it may be said the moon does not only show no traces of habitation, but it wants certain conditions of life, such as air and moisture, clouds and winds; but supposing that these are found in other planets of the system, shall we not grant that there may be life in them? It may be so, but ‘yet we should be led to judge also by analogy that the life which they sustain is more different from the terrestrial life of the present period of the earth than that is from the terrestrial life of any former geological period in proportion as the *conditions of light, and heat, and attraction, and density* are more different on any other planet than they can have been on the earth at any period of its history.’

He proceeds then to examine those conditions in reference to the question whether the planets are peopled. And, first, he compares Jupiter with the Earth. The Star of Jove, so beautiful and large, is about a quarter of the earth’s density, and is, probably, a mere sphere of water. This is proved by his oblate figure, and by his belts. It is possible even that he may be a mass of ice. The force of gravity, too, at his surface is so strong that animals of large dimensions would be oppressed by their own weight. If there are living creatures in a planet, the materials of which are so light, the gravity so strong, the heat so little, and the waters so deep, they must be boneless, watery, pulpy, glutinous masses. But if Jupiter be a mere mass of water, with perhaps a few cinders at the centre, and an envelope of clouds around it, it seems very possible that he may not be a seat of life at all. It may be asked of what use then that splendid array of moons which circle his brow? The answer is—of what use our moon when it rolled around the uninhabited primitive rocks? As to Saturn, the larger portion of his globe seems to be vapour. If, therefore, he has inhabitants, which is extremely unlikely, they are ‘aqueous, gelatinous creatures; too sluggish, almost, to be deemed alive, floating in their ice-cold waters,

shrouded for ever by their humid skies. To them the glories of moons and rings would not avail to give much pleasure, nor would the solar eclipses of fifteen years' duration, to which their planet is sometimes liable, give much pain. The case is still stronger, and on the same grounds, with Uranus and Neptune. Mars approaches more nearly to the condition of the earth, but his distance from the sun, his density, and cold, would fit him for the abode rather of the great land and sea saurians, the iguanodon, and dinotherium, than such animals as live at present on earth. The small asteroids are not, of course, held to be inhabited, they seem either fragments of an exploded world, or, as our author holds, 'results of some imperfectly effected concentration of the elements of a new planet, never fully formed,' and are chiefly remarkable besides, because the tiny specimens they have sent our world in the shape of meteoric stones, contain no chemical elements but such as are to be found in the mass of the earth. As to Venus, it is hard to say what kind of animals we could place in her, except, perhaps, the microscopic creatures, with silicious coverings, which, as modern explorers assert, are almost indestructible by heat. The difficulty in reference to Mercury is vastly greater. Thus, in no part of the solar system, except in some measure in Mars, does he find the conditions for supporting animal existence, like what alone we can conceive animal existence to be.

In the Tenth chapter he gives his theory of the Solar system as a whole scheme. Jupiter and Saturn are spheres of water and aqueous vapour, combined, it may be, with atmospheric air, in which their cloudy belts float over their deep oceans. Earth, too, has a considerable atmosphere of air and vapour. In Venus and Mercury we see no traces of any gaseous or aqueous atmosphere. His conclusion is, that the water and the vapour, which belong to the solar system, are driven off to the outer regions of its vast circuit; while the interior masses—Mars, Earth, Venus, and Mercury, are solid and dense. The differentia, therefore, of Earth's physical condition is this, she is situated just in that region of the system where the existence of matter, alike in a *solid*, a *fluid*, and a *gaseous* condition, is possible. Outside Earth, or at least Mars, there is, in the planets, no solid matter; inside, toward the sun, there are no traces of water, vapour, or gas. Earth alone combines ground to stand on; air to breathe; water to nourish vegetables and animals; solid matter to supply materials for their more solid parts; and withal a due supply of light and heat, a due energy of the force of weight. It is thus peculiarly adapted, by a curious and complex combination of properties and relations which are found in no other planet, to be,

and is, probably, the sole world of life. Here he is reminded of the zones in the earth itself, and expresses the analogy in the following beautiful words: 'The earth is the temperate zone of the solar system. In that zone alone is the play of hot and cold, of moist and dry, possible. The torrid zone of the earth is not free from moisture; it has its rains, for it has its cold upper atmosphere. But how much hotter are Venus and Mercury than the torrid zone? There no cold vapours can linger, they are expelled by the fierce solar energy; and there is no cool stratum to catch and return them. If they were there, they must fly to the outer regions; to the cold abodes of Saturn and Jupiter: if on their way the Earth did not with cold and airy finger outstretched afar catch a few drops of their treasures, for the use of plant, and beast, and man.' He then shows that the earth is really the largest, because densest planetary body in the system; for the vast globes, Jupiter and Saturn, Uranus and Neptune, are only huge masses of vapour and water. The Earth, he says, is the domestic hearth of the solar system, adjusted between the hot and fiery haze on one side, the cold and watery vapour on the other. He closes by asserting that this theory alone brings together all these known phenomena, the great size and small density of the exterior planets, their belts and streaks, Saturn's ring, Jupiter's oblateness, the great number of satellites to the exterior planets, the planetoid bodies between Jupiter and Mars, the appearance of definite shapes of land and water in Mars, shooting stars, the zodiacal light, the appearance of Venus so different from Mars, and, finally, the material composition of meteoric stones. He proves also that it coincides with the nebular hypothesis so far as it goes.

In the Eleventh chapter he encounters the objection—Would God, the God whose works swarm with design, have left such vast spaces of the universe empty? This he meets in the most masterly and eloquent manner; proving that, although they were empty, they would still serve most important ends, and produce most blessed effects upon man; and that they have all bearing and connexion with his mysterious history and that of his planet. God works, besides, on a scale so immense, that 'the planets and stars may only be the lumps which have flown from the potter's wheel of the Great Worker, the shred coils which in the working sprang from his mighty lathe; the sparks which darted from his awful anvil when the solar system lay incandescent thereon; the curls of vapour which rose from the great caldron of creation when its elements were separated.' He asserts, in fine, that, although these stars and systems had only been made to form decorations and scenery to earth, as the stage of the Tragedy of the Cross, they had not been created in vain.

In the Twelfth chapter he shows more fully God's one grand purpose in creation to be connected with the moral and spiritual history of man; and brings forward a number of additional reflections to prove that man is confined to this earth, and that no portion of any similar species is found in the stars. God may have, and probably has, other spheres of Divine government, and these peopled with his subjects and servants; but it were rash and unadvised to place those extra mundane spheres in orbs on which we must reason upon *physical* grounds, and to which many of the laws and properties of terrestrial matter and motion apply.

In the Thirteenth and last chapter, he lifts up, very reverently, a portion of the veil of the future. He inclines to the belief that God is to interpose, by a new creation, or rather re-creation, of man; that thus he may organize a divine society on earth. But, as to the how or the when, the times, seasons, or methods of this interference, he does not venture to dogmatize.

This is, we admit, a very imperfect analysis of this admirable volume; but although we have been compelled, by want of space, to omit many of its most important arguments and illustrations, and often to break up the exquisite chain-work of his reasoning, we have, we think, fairly represented its sentiments, as a whole. The book, particularly in the last four chapters, contains much that is as eloquent, powerful, and poetical in language, as it is piercingly acute and suggestive in thought. If it be, as report says, Dr. Whewell's, it is, certainly, in eloquence and originality, a vast stride in advance of his former works. We could, indeed, point out a number of minor slips in style, language, and quotation,* besides two or three self-contradictions in statement. But it is time that we came to the closing remarks which we promised.

Firstly. We regard this book as a blow in the face of Nature-worship, which, in our day, and particularly among the young and the poetical, has become an absolute idolatry. Our heart is sick, as we remember the Brahminical ravings about nature uttered by one class and echoed by another in more measured and mathematical tones. Here we have a Carlyle shouting out his wild wolf-like Eureka about earth, 'She is my mother and divine.' There Emerson sings his hymns to 'Nature,' and as he steps over puddles and barren moors, under dull and dripping skies, 'almost fears to say how glad he is.' Yonder, poets and poetasters

* The quotation in p. 249 from Mr. Owen, 'On the Nature of Limbs,' which makes the Professor say as his own what he cites as the language of Cudworth, and represents him as believing what he opposes.

without number are emulously contending which of them shall say the most extravagant things in praise of the stars, and the smoke of ten thousand censers is steaming up the unconscious midnight. Yonder comes a lady, proposing in very bad verse that we shall henceforth recur to the old Gebir faith, and worship the sun. And in remoter distance stand the authors of the 'Vestiges,' and the 'Constitution of Man,' surrounded by their many mean-eyed votaries, and offering a more vulgar homage, unredeemed by any poetical elements, to their great deity the Diana of development. In this lamentable state of things it is refreshing to find one who is at once a master in science and a man of genius, coming forward and saying to this motley multitude, 'Stop, my friends, you are going a little too fast; you are like certain people of old, worshipping ye know not *what*. The stars are *not* worlds, they are mere chaotic masses. Nature is not such a finished rounded thing as you dream, much less is it God; it is only a crude process, not a perfected result, far less a living cause. This Universe, glorious as it looks to *man's* imagination, is not divine, is not infinite, is not beautiful even; it is but clay in the hands of an Almighty Potter. The earth is not our mother; we are not the children of development; we are born from above. Away with your childish worship of the gilded gingerbread you call natural beauty. Admire it, indeed, as much as you may; but if you wish to worship, in God's name choose a fitter object. Worship the Great Spirit, who is *in* the Universe, indeed, but who is not to be identified with it.' Before the words of this author how do illusions vanish! How does the glory of the sun, moon, and stars become but the morning light shining on the towers of a prison, or the gateway of an asylum, or the pinnacles and palaces of some Sodom of sin! Or rather we should say, how *would* his words produce such a disenchantment were it not for the bright futurity he depicts as awaiting man, and which becomes verily a 'glory that excelleth,' not a false, but a true and lasting lustre.

2nd. The author's deductions seem to us to coincide strikingly with the spirit and statements of Scripture. The tendency of these is to insulate our earth from the rest of the universe, as Sinai was from the wilderness, and to reveal it as the scene of a special display of Divine power, wisdom, and goodness. Thus, Moses, after describing, with considerable minuteness and at some length, the arrangements of our earth in preparation for the coming of man, when he speaks of the creation of the remoter orbs of the system, says, as if in a marginal note, or a parenthesis, 'He made the stars also.' And never, throughout the whole volume of inspiration, is the slightest hint given that there are any beings in space, except angels, men, devils, and the persons of the God-

head,—classes which exhaust those beings ‘in heaven,’ ‘on the earth,’ in the sea, ‘and under the earth,’ whom John describes as joining in a hymn to the Lamb; although Chalmers tries, with very indifferent success, to press them into the service of the popular theory. And in that sublime soliloquy of Wisdom in the Proverbs, the forming of the earth as a habitation for man, is made the climax of the strain, and the creation of the heavens is introduced as a mere preliminary step.

3rd. This theory puts man and his history in their true light. Our author’s demolition of the development theory is the most compact, complete, and triumphant we have ever read. He sees in man an incarnation of the Divine Mind, not only superior in degree, but essentially different in kind, from that of animals. He feels the depth and grand emphasis of the words, ‘Let *us* make man in *our own* image, and after *our own* likeness.’ He rejects with grave and severe scorn the notion that man has crawled up to his present position from the low level of the brute, and that forsooth a fungus can develop into a Foster, a worm into a Wordsworth, an ape into a Newton! He grants, indeed, that man has fallen; but he sees that this very fall has been the means of showing his importance in a new light, and of concentrating the divine regards upon him with peculiar intensity. But for the fall, the far nobler incarnation, of which Jesus is the first and highest instance, had never taken place, and the Model-Man, after whose pattern the human family, during the better days of the Church, are to be re-made, had never been born. ‘Sun, moon, and stars, what are ye in your brute burning masses, compared to the mystery transacted in that corner of a Jewish manger?’ And around that manger he sees, not only sages, but (as in the dream of Joseph) the sun, the moon, and the stars doing obeisance to the Infant God,—to that Second Man from heaven, who is the germ, pledge, and pattern of a sublimer creation. Feeling that, in the presence even of fallen man, matter dwindles into insignificance, he *might* have used this language of another: ‘The creation, large and magnificent as it is, is not equal in grandeur or worth to one immortal mind. Majestic the universe is, but can it think, or feel, or reason, or imagine, or hope, or love?’ Talk to me of the sun! One might say, standing up in all the conscious dignity of his own nature: ‘The sun is not alive: he is but a dead luminary, after all; I am alive; I never was dead; I never can die. I may therefore put my foot on that proud orb and say, I am greater than thou. The sun cannot, with all his rays, write on flower, or grass, or the broad page of ocean, the name of God. A child of seven can, and is therefore greater than the sun. The sun cannot from his vast surface utter an articulate sound. He is a magnificent

mute ; but out of the mouth of babes and sucklings God perfects praise. The sun shall perish ; but I have that within me that shall never die. He might, indeed, or the universe of which he is a part, arise and "crush me ; but I should *know* he was crushing me. I should be conscious of the defeat ; he should not be conscious of the victory." The whole material universe, in short, is only the nursery to my immortal mind ; and whether is greater, the nursery, or the child ? I am a spirit, and *it* is only a great and glorious clod.'

4th. It shows us the proper limits of science. Scientific men, dazzled with the triumphs of the past, have become infatuated in their worship of science and of themselves. They have talked as if geometry and the telescope had endowed them and their methods with omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence. The book before us, while undeifying matter, abates also the proud pretensions of those sciences which deal exclusively with it, seeking to bring thinkers down from those dreary wastes of space, of which we are never likely to know much that can satisfy our souls, to that moral and religious truth which lies around and within us, and its motto might be,

'The proper study of mankind is man.'

Man in these pages becomes *the centre of science* and of creation, and we are carried back from those remote regions where Fancy and Reason are alike appalled to this small but most important homestead of earth, and to Calvary, which is, morally and spiritually, as it was long ago called, the Navel of the World.

5th. It points forward emphatically to the Future and to the real Infinite. Well might the author take up the words of Young, in his immortal poem :—

'This is the bud of being, the dim dawn,
The twilight of our day, the vestibule ;
Life's theatre as yet is shut, and death,
Strong death, alone can heave the massive bar,
This gross impediment of clay remove,
And make us embryos of existence free ;
Embryos we must be till we burst the shell,
Yon ambient azure shell, and spring to life,
The life of gods, O transport, and of man.'

He sees in the upper heavens creation not complete, but *travailing in birth*. He sees in these our lower regions, nature and man 'waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God,' and hears them groaning as they wait. He feels that, hitherto, the history of things and men would be a fearful farce, a hopeless mystery, a dream of nightmare, were it not for the explanations and the

prospects of the future. He knows that the Universe is not the real Infinite, only its antechamber, and that at death we pass out of and beyond it for ever; that, in the words of Macintosh to Hall, 'we awake from this dream into other spheres of existence.' And so far are these thoughts from ministering despair, that they become in his bosom an everwelling spring of hope, consolation, and joy; for, in the fine old language of Herbert, his soul is purged to hear

'Church bells beyond the stars,'

and he is ever haunted by

'The sound of glory ringing in his ears;'

glory for this earth, poor and putrid in many respects, but as yet the chief amid its starry kindred, and destined to higher pre-eminence still; and glory for man, who is even at present, although 'subject to vanity,' at the head of creation, and who, when delivered into the glorious liberty of the sons of God, shall, by his union with higher intelligences, and his connexion with the mightier movements of an upper sphere, realize the mystic marriage sung by the same holy poet,

'Sweet day; so cool, so calm, so bright,
The Bridal of the earth and sky.'

ART. II.—*Nouvelle Lettres de Madame La Duchesse D'Orléans, Princesse Palatine, Mère du Regent. Traduites de l'Allemand pour la première fois, par G. Brunet, et accompagnées de Notes Historiques et de Fragments Inédits.* New Letters of the Duchess of Orleans, the Mother of the Regent, and Princess Palatine. Now first translated from the German by G. Brunet, with Historical Notes, and unedited Fragments. Paris: Charpentier. 1853.

CHARLOTTE ELIZABETH, afterwards Duchess of Orleans, and mother of the too famous Regent, was born at the Castle of Heidelberg, on the 7th of July, 1652. Her education was such as German princesses in those days received, when they were left almost entirely free to follow the dictates of their own inclinations. Owing chiefly perhaps to her own tastes, her habits were rather those of a man than a woman. She loved dogs, horses, hunting; and such studies as she pursued were as masculine as her amuse-

ments. Her mind may have taken this turn, partly, perhaps, because she was so ugly and ill-formed—at least according to her own account—that she scarcely indulged in the common hopes and aspirations of her sex. It appeared extremely improbable, that any one who would be thought a proper match for the daughter of the Elector Palatine, at whose court the most extravagant notions prevailed on the subject of rank, should ever present himself as a suitor for her hand.

She was, therefore, labouring to reconcile herself to the condition of single blessedness, which in a court is far more irksome than anywhere else, when an offer, brilliant beyond all her hopes and expectations, was made in the usual way to her father. Monsieur, brother of Louis the Fourteenth, having recently lost his first wife—it is supposed by poison—was instructed to cast his eyes on the heiress of the Palatinate. Ambition in those days regulated the disposal of the heart, or rather of the hand, for marriage was simply a roving commission which entitled both husband and wife to follow the bent of their own desires, in whatever direction they might point. This was above all the case in Germany, which from time immemorial has been a sort of hot-bed for raising princes and princesses for exportation.

Of course Charlotte Elizabeth was in no way consulted on the subject of her marriage. Her father disposed of her as he would have disposed of a horse or a greyhound, and packed her off for France without the slightest affectation of ceremony. On arriving at the court of Louis the Fourteenth, the young German princess experienced no inconsiderable perplexity. Her husband was a man of weak mind and depraved manners, an opprobrium to his own family, and an object of derision to foreigners. For such a person it was impossible she should have any deep affection. In the first place, he gave her none, because in truth he had none to give, being so completely absorbed by the lower exigencies of his nature that his soul never could raise itself to the level of emotion or love. He married because it was respectable to possess a wife, or rather, perhaps, because his brother, who in this respect, at least, was incomparably his superior, detested his irregular propensities, and preferred paying deference to the laws of nature. Yet poor Charlotte Elizabeth very soon perceived that she had not been transported from Heidelberg to Paris, or St. Cloud, or Versailles to recline on a bed of roses. Her appearance was uninviting, her manners were ungraceful, or rather awkward and uncouth. She spoke the French language imperfectly, and was inspired by the most intolerable pride of birth. In his serious moments this was a recommendation to the king, who also greatly prided himself on being descended from a long line of regal bandits. But

vice is levelling almost as much as virtue. The king's mistresses, many of them low women, filled the court with their cabals and intrigues, and brought the most merciless raillery into fashion. From the wounds inflicted by this weapon neither man nor woman could escape; and when accompanied, as it then was, by the most unbounded indulgence in scandal, it must be acknowledged that a poor half-educated German girl, very bashful and very plain, had little prospect before her of a happy life.

She brought Monsieur several children, among whom one was the Duke of Orleans, Regent of France, while her two daughters became queens. It is scarcely to be doubted that at first, as was natural, she sought to accommodate herself to the fashions prevailing around her, but finding this altogether impracticable, she soon took refuge in comparative retirement and study. Some portion of her time, princess as she was, she devoted to the care of her children, and the remainder, which she could not otherwise fill, she gave up to the practice of incessant letter-writing. Besides, the amount of leisure enjoyed at a court, especially by persons of high rank, is not very great. Even while engaged in writing one long letter she was often interrupted by visitors twenty or thirty times, and as etiquette required her to talk a little with every one who came, this was no trifling sacrifice. Her correspondents, at first few, multiplied as she advanced in life. She wrote to her aunts, to her cousins, and afterwards to her daughters, describing, in a minute manner, the every-day details of court life, relating scandalous anecdotes, drawing characters with more or less impartiality, and putting her own interpretation, sometimes far from a correct one, on the events she witnessed.

There is one peculiarity in the letters of this princess, we mean the intrepidity with which she speaks of whatever comes to her knowledge, that renders them more valuable than the writings of many authors greatly her superiors in ability. But, while indulging in the unrestrained liberty of observation, she cannot often be accused of malice. When she, therefore, brings down historical figures from their pedestals, and places them on the common level of court existence, we are not to attribute this to her envy or vindictiveness. She was as fond of Louis XIV. as a German princess could be of a Frenchman. She delights, also, to dwell on what she considered his great qualities, and pronounces, as she goes along, many a panegyric on his amiable virtues. Posterity may be at a loss to discover what those virtues were, but in her eyes he had a great many, and, therefore, we may, with the greater confidence, accept her testimony on the subject of his ignorance, his vice, his bigotry, and his contemptible weaknesses.

It would be erroneous to suppose that the ill instructed daughter of the Count Palatine could estimate, at their proper value, all the statesmen and generals with whom her position rendered her familiar. That of which she could judge was their manners, their morals, and the influence which, through these, they exerted on the social system of France. The schemes they formed for developing the civilization of their country, their financial or commercial ideas, their plans of conquest or defence, or even the intrigues into which they were urged by their ambition, exceeded the grasp of her intelligence. On these points, accordingly, it would be unreasonable to consult her letters. Historians of the greatest capacity have often failed in the attempt to do justice to the contemporaries of Louis XIV. Accustomed to the finished pictures of the Greek and Roman writers, one class has endeavoured to exalt them greatly beyond their merits, while, to escape the charge of pedantry, justly incurred by such exaggeration, another class has indulged in satire and caricature. To the latter, rather than to the former, the Duchess of Orleans supplies materials; but while we accept her information, and are not inclined to dispute her sincerity, we are frequently compelled to doubt the accuracy of her judgment.

It is quite otherwise when she is engaged in drawing the portraits of such men as Louis XIV. himself, her husband, the Chevalier de Lorraine, and even her son. These she is quite competent to paint. Still more completely does it fall within her province to delineate the ladies who distinguished themselves upon that stage of pomp and iniquity. With respect to one individual of this sex, the famous Madame de Maintenon, her prejudices may, perhaps, be allowed to have neutralized her sagacity. But many memoir writers, male and female, and compilers, falsely called historians, who without discrimination have adopted their reports, amuse themselves and their readers by exalting this intriguing woman into a sort of goddess. Still, it is impossible to call in question the strength and steadiness of her resolution, or the profound subtilty of her character. Much of what she accomplished may be set down to the account of circumstances. But when we contemplate her as a simple spectator in the crowd assembled to witness the arrival in Paris of the young queen from Spain, then consider her as the wife of the deformed poet, Scarron, afterwards behold her as the governess of Madame de Montespan's children, and ultimately witness her ascent to the highest place which a woman can fill in French society, we are forced to recognise her claim to be considered the ablest woman of her time. In her, the passions, the affections, the emotions, were held in complete subordination to the judgment. Whether chaste or unchaste, parsimonious or lavish of

her fortune, faithful or faithless to her friends, she kept her eye fixed steadily on the point to which she desired to attain. Her mental and moral resources were extraordinary. No woman's fascination was greater when she desired to fascinate. At one time she suggested the idea of another Cleopatra, all passion and voluptuousness; and at another, of a rigid politician, caring for nothing but influence in the regulation of state affairs; and presently afterwards, she appeared, even to careful observers, to be absorbed entirely by ascetic ideas of devotion. To Louis XIV. she presented herself successively in all these lights. First, she captivated him by the richness of her form, the brilliance of her eyes, the luxurious grace of her movements; she next obtained ascendancy over his mind by suggesting prudent counsel in his affairs, domestic and public; and lastly, she gave irresistible force to her authority, by wielding, with consummate adroitness, the weapon of superstition.

To estimate such a woman was not within the competence of the Duchess of Orleans. In the lively gossip of her correspondence, she often appears nothing more than a vulgar *intriguante*. Sometimes, the most offensive epithets are applied to her in the impotence of outraged vanity; and, no doubt, the persons most favourable to Madame de Maintenon will admit that the very strongest terms supplied by language might occasionally be applied to her conduct without much impropriety. Through her instigations it was that Louis XIV. was led to perpetrate some of the most portentous acts of wickedness which disgraced his reign. Owing her ascent, in a great measure, to the aid afforded by the disciples of Loyola, she could not afterwards, even had she felt the inclination, refuse to co-operate with them in the development of their iniquitous designs. The hands which had proved so powerful in bringing about her elevation, would otherwise have hurled her remorselessly from the bad eminence she had reached, even, if need were, by poison or the dagger. To them, therefore, she was bound, and it would be highly instructive, if it were possible, to explain the secret connexion between this remarkable woman and the 'Order of Jesus.'

From what has been said, it is evident that we are not to look in these letters for a key to the more important characters or events of Louis XIV.'s reign. Yet, if we properly study her minute and apparently trivial revelations, we may obtain considerable assistance. Among other things, we are shown very distinctly the means by which the French nobility forfeited and lost their position in society. The entire court was nothing better than one vast hell, in which gambling was perpetually carried on in its most profligate forms, in connexion with every cognate and congenial vice. To provide the means of indulging this

propensity, men sacrificed their estates, and women their virtue. Princes and lacqueys, duchesses and courtesans, stood confounded together, by the base desire of gain, and many ancient houses, with an historical lustre around their names, sank into hopeless poverty, and disappeared altogether from public life. All employments in France, as well at court as in the army, were at that time sold for money, and as the aristocracy, ruined by their vices, were at length unable to command the means of purchasing them, the richer bourgeoisie became their rivals, and drove them gradually out of the field.

At the same time the government exhibited the most reckless indifference towards the rights, the comforts, and even the lives of all orders of the people. At first the king enjoyed the command of an immense revenue, which enabled him to afflict the territories of his neighbours with all the horrors and miseries of war, and while so doing, to exhibit in his various palaces the utmost splendour and extravagance of luxury. His mistresses blazed with jewels, and their apartments, as well as his own, with plate of gold; they devoured nightly at their suppers the revenues of whole provinces, and fortunes of great magnitude were won and lost in half an hour at play. As the regal prodigal and his companions of both sexes passed through the streets of Paris, the dazzled multitude rent the air with acclamations. But wars are expensive pleasures. Louis XIV. by degrees exhausted the resources of France, and annihilated, at the same time, his own popularity. The people died in the streets by hundreds of cold and hunger, the provinces were depopulated, famine became a frequent visitor, and the king, who had formerly been regarded as an object of idolatry, passed through the streets unnoticed, or only excited manifestations of disgust. He was driven to make in his own dwelling sacrifices which were utterly contemptible when regarded as means of carrying on a great foreign war; he melted, for example, his gold plate into money, and supplied its place with articles of common earthenware. Had this change been made to effect some good purpose, it would have been entitled to praise; but, designed as it was, to multiply scenes of blood and slaughter, it excites nothing but scorn and execration. This Louis himself at length, when too late, discovered. He descended to the grave amid the curses of the French people, and bequeathed to his successors an empty treasury, a public credit destroyed, a debauched aristocracy, an impoverished and indignant people, and the fiery Nemesis of a revolution.

There are circumstances, however, which should make us pause before we condemn with unmitigated severity this pompous and selfish, but, at the same time, unhappy man. It is no doubt true that the private sufferings of Louis XIV. were no com-

pensation to the inhabitants of the devastated Palatinate, or to the persecuted and exiled Protestants. Yet, considered in himself, even this king excites our compassion. He had not in his childhood or in his youth received that elevating knowledge or that wholesome discipline which leads men to feel for others, or to reflect properly on their own conduct. Cardinal Mazarin, who must be considered as his father, and his weak and irresolute mother conspired to bring him up in ignorance and immorality. All around him contributed, by adulation and the most culpable compliances of all sorts, to inspire him with a false idea of his own character and position. He never understood politics or properly felt the responsibility attaching to the regulation of a nation's affairs. He had been taught to consider everything simply with reference to himself, to his grandeur, to his reputation, to his pleasures, and never once imagined that the office he filled only rendered him the first servant of the public. Acting in conformity with his own theory, he at once ruined the country, and laid up for himself an inexhaustible store of anguish and remorse. His wife, whom he had deeply wronged, died before him ; his mistresses each in her turn betrayed and disgraced him ; most of his children became monsters of depravity, and surrounded even his death-bed with proofs of their worthlessness and ingratitude. Dissensions, mutual hatreds, and secret projects of revenge obviously prevailed among them, and almost with his last breath he strove, with the consciousness perhaps that he strove in vain, to reconcile them to each other.

Nevertheless, according to the Duchess of Orleans, he exhibited much equanimity and resignation at the approach of death. He was perhaps glad to die. For many years he had encountered nothing but defeat and humiliation abroad, witnessed nothing in France but increasing poverty and discontent, and found nothing in his own family but unkindness, meanness, and moral turpitude. Even the yoke of Madame de Maintenon, rendered more galling by the interference of the Jesuits, may have secretly become insupportable to him, so that, with the philosopher of Malmesbury, he may have said inwardly, if not outwardly, that he should be glad to find any hole to creep out of the world at. His sister-in-law, whose letters throw so much light on the character and constitution of his court, evidently entertained a strong affection for him, notwithstanding that she never spared in her secret representation to friends in Germany or in England his failings or his vices. She was herself growing old at the period of his death, and, though she does not quite confess the fact in her very frank communications, it seems probable that the character of her son, who for some years was to take the king's place in public affairs, inspired her with little confidence.

The peculiar weakness of Charlotte Elizabeth naturally inclined her to view everything royal with veneration, and it is curious to observe the struggle which constantly takes place in her mind, when her inveterate love of gossip leads her to depreciate any regal personage. But wholly incapable of reserve, she first or last lets everything out. Even the Regent does not escape her maternal frankness, for, though she always maintains him to be good, she is very careful to prove him to be wicked. So again, when the necessities of her correspondence lead her to speak of Louis XV. in his boyhood, after calling him handsome, charming, and so on, she throws out insinuations which would have undoubtedly led an observing person to foresee the character of his reign. Though ignorant and undisciplined like his father, he was full of conceit and profoundly self-willed. The very form of his head, as she describes it, excites a prejudice against him; it was round, hard, repulsive, and though the features were well-formed, his face inspired neither love nor confidence. He is, besides, supposed to have been corrupted at a very early age by his governess, whom alone for many years he regarded with anything like preference. Everybody else was irksome to him, and it seems highly probable that this was as much owing to his own evil nature as to the insidious instruction he received.

There are libels existing in French literature, under the name of memoirs or chronicles, which undertake to reveal, with far too great boldness, the mysteries of the Regency. Upon these, of course, when unsupported by other evidence, we cannot place much reliance. But if we examine carefully the revelations of the Duchess of Orleans, we shall see that the fabricators of fiction did not much exaggerate, perhaps because they could not, the excesses of the Regent and his associates; or rather, we should perhaps say, of nearly the whole aristocracy. The audacious immorality of Pope Alexander VI. was rivalled, if not exceeded, by that of the Regent and his three daughters. To convey an adequate idea of their achievements in vice would exceed the licence granted to history or criticism. We must leave the picture to be filled up by the reader's imagination, but may remark, by the way, that the letters of Charlotte Elizabeth suggest only part of the truth, though quite enough to justify the most portentous suspicions.

With one of the most remarkable episodes, in what may not improperly be called her son's reign, most persons are tolerably familiar: we mean Law's Mississippi scheme. Still, she supplies numerous particulars which were wanting to complete the delineation of that startling folly. But the pens of princesses assume a liberty, especially when writing to each other, which we

can neither envy nor imitate. It may be sufficient to observe, that in their eagerness for money, ladies of the highest rank in France overstepped all the bounds of modesty and decorum. Regarding Law as a magician, rather than as a financier, and ready to perform or submit to anything by which they might enrich themselves, they pursued the adventurous Scotchman into the most private recesses of his house. To obtain admittance they had often recourse to the most ludicrous contrivances. One duchess ordered her coachman to upset her carriage opposite his door, and when he appeared to be proceeding a little too far, she thrust her head out of the window and screamed aloud: 'Upset now, upset now, you rogue!' Mr. Law's coachman, partly by speculation, partly through the enormous presents he received by way of bribe, was soon in a condition to quit his lucrative employment. As he had always conducted himself properly, the financier very much regretted his loss, and honestly told him so. The coachman replied that he was very much flattered, but that if Mr. Law would trust to him, he would undertake to recommend him a person every way equal to himself; Law, who was a good-natured fellow, was resolved to humour his Jehu, who made his appearance next morning, bringing two coachmen under his wing. He then gravely entered into their characters, and requested Mr. Law to make choice of the one he preferred. Mr. Law did so, and then inquired what was to become of the other? Oh, replied the man, with great naïveté: 'I shall take him for my own coachman.'

Occasionally the duchess varies the thread of her correspondence with tragical incidents, which the want of proper newspapers rendered extremely interesting to her friends. Her manner of relating is clever and exciting. She gives the circumstances as they come to her knowledge, and leaves you in doubt for several days or weeks, as the case may be, about the *dénouement*; for example, in one of her letters, we find the following startling narrative:—An abbé, the member of a noble family, who was greatly addicted to gambling, and led in other ways a disreputable life, went out rather late one evening to sup with a female relative. He had won at play several thousand golden Louis, which he shut up in a cabinet in his bedroom. To meet the demands which they who indulge in games of hazard may have at any moment made upon them, he was, moreover, in the habit of carrying considerable sums of money upon his person. In those days the streets of Paris were not quite so safe as they are at present. The monarchy, by impoverishing the people, tended to multiply footpads and cut-throats, so that it was by no means uncommon for nocturnal revellers to stumble over dead bodies in the streets. The abbé,

however, escaped all external perils, and arrived safe and sound at the door of his own lodgings. Ringing the great bell, he awoke the *concierge* or porter, who distinctly remembered the late hour at which he returned, as well as the fact that he appeared to be in a state of great excitement. His valet, whom he had had in his service for many years, came half way down the stairs to meet him. They then mounted to the abbé's chamber together, and the porter distinctly heard them shut the door. After that the whole house became perfectly quiet, and there being no more lodgers to be admitted, the *concierge* and his wife retired quietly to bed.

Next morning, when they arose, the wife, in pursuance of her avocations, went into what we should call the drawing-room, which lay exactly under the abbé's bedchamber. On throwing open the shutters she was astonished to observe upon the floor, which was composed of variegated patterns in polished oak, small pools of blood, which were constantly increased by drops from the ceiling, which on looking up she perceived to be discoloured to a very large extent. Greatly alarmed, she rushed out of the apartment and told her husband. The terrified couple having awakened some of the humbler lodgers, proceeded along with them to the abbé's bedroom, which they found locked on the outside but with the key in the door. It may easily be imagined that they did not turn the key or enter without much trepidation. Nor were their fears groundless, for they had not advanced many steps before they found the unfortunate abbé lying stretched upon the floor, with his head literally severed from his body. Such sights freeze the blood of persons unaccustomed to slaughter, and therefore the whole of these good people stood for some time perfectly aghast, gazing at the hideous spectacle before them. They instinctively asked themselves who could have committed so shocking a crime, and probably the thoughts of all fixed immediately upon the valet. He alone possessed the key of the abbé's room; the porter had heard them enter together, and, so far as he knew, there was no other person in the house upon whom suspicion could with any probability alight. The valet, therefore, must be the criminal, and the process which had gone on in the porter's mind was repeated in the imagination of all his companions.

But weak and inconclusive is the logic of sudden fright. On looking a few paces further, they observed the unhappy object of their suspicions weltering in his blood upon the floor, and likewise with his head severed from his body. This discovery of course bewildered them, because it now became necessary to look further for the murderer, and they all shuddered at the thought that it might perhaps be one of themselves. At all

events they looked most uncomfortably at each other, and speedily vacated the apartment to lay an account of the dreadful catastrophe before the proper authorities.

At this stage of the proceedings, the story was related to the Duchess of Orleans, who, according to custom, immediately introduced it into her letters, and circulated it by the next post through the greater part of Europe. The persons who received these communications were necessarily put upon the very tenter-hooks of curiosity. Who could possibly have killed the abbé and his valet? For several days, perhaps weeks, they must inevitably remain in ignorance, though everybody in Paris, as the duchess assured them, was talking of nothing else. Perhaps the dreadful secret might have been divulged, and while they were torturing themselves with horrible imaginings, the poorest applewoman in the streets of the favoured capital of France might be in possession of the knowledge which was denied to them. Meanwhile the honest duchess went on writing, mixing up farce, tragedy and comedy together, sometimes making her female friends laugh and sometimes weep. From the conclusion of the abbé's story, however, she abstained for a considerable time. At length the fact is introduced that the valet had a wife, and that this wife loved a man who was not her husband, a common soldier, too, in the Grenadier Guards. These persons, it was discovered, were the actors in the fearful tragedy; but the woman only was apprehended, for the villanous soldier, her partner in guilt, effected his escape, leaving her to face death alone. Here again the duchess makes a break in her narrative, and amuses herself with matters infinitely trivial. You conclude, consequently, as you read the volume, that you are to hear no more of the abbé's murderers, and become by degrees almost reconciled to remain in ignorance. But by and by the merciless letter-writer reverts to the tragedy, and lets fall the significant phrase that the criminals had defrauded justice by committing suicide. We infer, consequently, that the soldier was apprehended, though when, where, and in what manner, we are not informed.

When the Duchess of Orleans happens to be in the comic vein, which is very often, her stories assume a character which prevents our making unreserved use of them. She had brought with her from Germany no very remarkable degree of refinement, and was probably inclined by nature to look contemptuously on the conventionalities of society; but when to her indigenous coarseness the experience she acquired at the court of Louis XIV. had been added, it is difficult to imagine anything which she would not have written or said. This German frankness, of which even her editors complain, spoils some of her best stories. There is one, however, totally free from this fault, of which we

shall endeavour to convey some idea to our readers. To enter fully into the spirit of it would require much familiarity with the French court of that day; but, independently of this, the narrative is sufficiently amusing.

The Duke de La Force having run through all his property, as dukes often do, died, leaving behind him an only daughter. To this young lady nature had been as unkind as fortune, for, according to the Duchess of Orleans, she was thoroughly ugly. Among the courtiers of that period this was regarded not so much in the light of a misfortune as of a crime; hence everybody appeared to be at liberty to despise and ridicule the ugly. Still Mademoiselle de La Force had not been treated so entirely like a step-daughter by nature as to be left altogether without attractions. Instead of other qualities, she possessed a large share of intelligence, extraordinary powers of conversation, and the most fascinating manners in the world, so that in the blaze of her mental endowments the plainness of her countenance was completely forgotten. It is by no means surprising, therefore, that one of the princes of the house of Condé should have been so enamoured of her as to determine, in spite of her poverty, to marry her. As may easily be imagined, all his relatives became greatly alarmed, and took counsel together respecting the best means of frustrating the lover's hopes. At the court Mademoiselle de La Force enjoyed the reputation of a sorceress, because, without beauty or opulence, she succeeded in casting a spell over men by mere dint of accomplishments. It was not without violence that the young scion of the house of Condé could be snatched from her side, and hurried away to the family palace at Chantilly. There, surrounded by all those 'potent, grave, and reverend seniors' who constituted the body of his relatives, he was taken to task like a child, and made distinctly to understand that through their influence with the king the marriage he contemplated with a person so much beneath him should certainly be prevented. Having no other resource, the young man formed the idea of escaping from the dilemma by drowning himself, and rushing forth into the garden, made directly towards a deep canal, bordered by poplars and willows, which ran, and still runs, at the bottom of it.

At this point of the story an incident occurs which has always appeared to us inexplicable. It suggested itself to the mind of this fiery lover that it would be more agreeable to drown himself without his clothes, and so he paused on the banks of the canal, and began deliberately to undress. Among the other things which he took off was an amulet, which Mademoiselle de La Force with her own fair hands had suspended by a riband about his neck. The moment he had done this all his love vanished

into empty air. He looked at the cold water of the canal with a shudder, and putting on his clothes again, and taking up the satchet, he returned into the palace, and having coolly related what had happened to his relatives, expressed his readiness to abandon his mistress for ever. In this way the young lady was deprived of her expected husband, and left to re-commence her attacks upon the hearts of men. It was not very long before another innamorato presented himself. This was a Monsieur de Brion, the son of a person high in office and influence, who, after the example of the Condé, offered the most violent opposition to the wishes of his heir. The plan he adopted promised to be no less effectual than theirs. Though the young man had reached the rational age of twenty-five, Monsieur de Brion shut him up like a child, and positively forbade him to hold any intercourse by letters or otherwise with his mistress. But if in one sense love be blind, it certainly exhibits great wealth of invention and quick-wittedness in others. Mademoiselle de La Force became acquainted with a wandering musician, who travelled about with a troop of tame bears, which he made to dance in the streets as he played. It should, perhaps, be observed that this lady was a writer of romances, and therefore familiar with all the ingenious devices of passion. She now formed a design by which she doubted not she should be able to triumph over the argus policy of the elder De Brion. Her scheme was to get herself sewed up in the skin of a bear, and in this disguise to proceed in company with her ursine friends to the court of Monsieur de Brion's house, there to dance and play tricks for the amusement of her lover, whom she contrived to apprise of her intentions. Her scheme succeeded. The musician played, the bears danced, the ardent lover descended to the court, and there, while apparently engaged in frolics with bruin, concerted a matrimonial rendezvous. The marriage took place, and the enchanted couple proceeded to Versailles, where Louis XIV. gave them apartments in the palace. But, alas! for the felicity of this world. De Brion, the father, proceeded like a tornado to the parliament of Paris, and there exerting his influence and his eloquence—perhaps also the force of his cash—obtained a dissolution of the marriage. Mademoiselle de La Force, once more become a spinster, abandoned all hopes of connubial life, and betook herself to the uniting of others in the pliant pages of romance, inwardly no doubt detesting that social system which thus enabled the wealthy and powerful to sport with the feelings and happiness of the poor.

From these recitals, which we preferred giving in our own words, the reader will be able to comprehend of what sort of materials the correspondence of the Duchess of Orleans consists. But she is not always relating anecdotes or telling stories.

Occasionally she draws characters, and when her prejudices do not stand in the way, she performs this difficult task with much ability. We may observe, however, that the new collection of letters is by no means so characteristic as the old one. In fact, the former editor, whoever he may have been, had made the best use of the materials at his disposal. It would probably be lost labour to reproduce the whole of her letters, because, as she was in the habit of repeating the same remarks and telling the same stories to three or four of her friends at the same time, and often exactly in the same language, her repetitions would soon become unendurable.

The picture she draws of her son, the Regent, which many persons censure as much too favourable, is, in our opinion, as free from partiality, as, considering it was drawn by a mother, it could possibly have been. She admits most of his vices and nearly all his faults, but is very naturally disposed to view them with as much leniency as possible. Besides it is very clear that the Regent was desirous of occupying as good a place in his mother's mind as circumstances would permit, a fact which we interpret greatly in his favour. When he desired to account to her for the reckless way in which he spent his evenings, he used to say that he got up at six in the morning and applied himself diligently to public business for ten or twelve hours, after which most persons besides a mother would acknowledge that some little relaxation was necessary. He had probably spent the day in this manner two or three times in his life, and was resolved to make the most of the phenomenon, in order that he might stand high for industry in the estimation of his mamma.

We are not quite convinced, moreover, that those historians who speak with unmitigated harshness of the Regent, are entitled to more confidence than his mother. When, for example, they say that he was the idlest of men, and that he thought of nothing but gratifying his worst passions, we are unable to accept their testimony literally. That his vices were very great, we admit; that his failings were still greater and more numerous is likewise true; but he was not altogether without his good qualities, among which were the frankness and facility with which he forgave his enemies, his freedom from the spirit of persecution, and the desire, which we believe to have been perfectly sincere, to benefit France to the utmost of his power.

Still we are far from being the apologists of the Duke of Orleans. What his own mother admits to his discredit is quite enough to determine the place he ought to occupy in history. He was an audacious and unscrupulous profligate, vehemently addicted to self-indulgence, and not very solicitous about the feelings or happiness of those who made themselves the ministers

of his pleasures. But if he treated them recklessly, he allowed them, without the slightest anger, to behave in exactly the same manner towards him. The women who professed to love him, were in all instances faithless, and he knew it; but, instead of considering himself entitled to take revenge, he evidently believed them to be justified, and continued to them all the favours and honours in his power. It was not to be expected that such a man should be desirous of acquiring a reputation in the world. He knew this to be impossible, and accordingly never made the attempt. But it was not too much to expect that he would take some care of his health, in order that he might live to revel in the enjoyments on which he set so much value. But this he did not do. When his physicians informed him that he was in danger of losing one of his eyes unless he changed his manner of living, or at least observed some degree of moderation, he paid no regard to their advice, but lived exactly as before, eating, drinking, and sitting up late, as if he had possessed a constitution of iron. The inflammation in the eye went on, therefore, and symptoms of apoplexy followed; but even when death stared him in the face, he persevered in his habitual indulgences, as if, like the Roman emperors, he cared not for existence, unless it was accompanied by the delights of sin. Some have inferred from this—and not, we confess, without probability—that so desperate a perseverance favours the supposition of his having been guilty of crimes so great, that he could only endure to live while his conscience was clouded by libertinism and excess. He was suspected of having indulged in the prevailing crime of the age—the poisoning of enemies; and the Princess des Ursins, who was among the circulators, or fabricators of this report, inspired extraordinary terror in his mother, when driven out of Spain she found herself under the necessity of returning to Paris. But this emissary of Madame de Maintenon experienced few scruples, when the character of man or woman was to be assailed. She had occupied the most mischievous post at the court of Spain, where she was a sort of professor of calumny, and the Duchess of Orleans consequently knew that the hatred which this termagant bore her son would induce her to let loose the flood-gates of her malice against him, whether he was innocent or guilty.

Another of the persons, whose characters are painted in this correspondence, is the Cardinal Dubois. Of this odious individual history has already, perhaps, said too much. Yet, he was possessed of extraordinary abilities, was learned, eloquent, and insinuating in his manners, and distinguished by so much effrontery, that no event in life ever appeared to disturb his

equanimity. It is not without some reason, therefore, that the Duchess of Orleans describes him as the evil genius of her son. A story is told of this man, in one of the memoirs of the time, which, because it has not been often repeated, we shall introduce briefly in this place. Though, as a priest, he was, of course, bound to celibacy, he became enamoured of a young girl in one of the distant provinces where he was then residing, and because he could win her love in no other way, he married her. For some time he was amused by her society, but his ambition at length urged him to seek his fortune in the capital, where the appearance of a priest with a wife would have been regarded as an absurdity too great for belief. The poor girl, therefore, was left behind, and in good faith and simplicity, waited many long years for his return; meanwhile, the adventurer had risen first to be an abbé and then a bishop, and was on the point of being raised to the rank of a cardinal, when he bethought him of his connubial exploit, and of the prejudice it might cause him should some enemy come to a knowledge of the fact, and make it public.

These difficulties Monsieur Dubois laid ingenuously before one of his friends, a member of the virtuous aristocracy celebrated by Burke, and this worthy nobleman undertook to deliver the future cardinal from all apprehension of the consequences of what was now termed his youthful folly. This scheme having been matured, the nobleman repaired to the village indicated by Dubois, and at the inn where he stopped, inquired, with apparent carelessness, about the village priest; saying, that if he were a jolly fellow, he should not dislike to be invited by him to dinner. The information was conveyed to the priest, and the desired invitation immediately came. Upon the quality of the dinner we need not dwell. The guest found it excellent, as well as the wines which followed. Dubois' friend could probably bear more wine than the worthy curé, and, besides, was too deeply interested in remaining perfectly sober to be betrayed into any excess. Adroitly, as if by accident, he introduced into their merry conversation the subject of the expectant cardinal's marriage, which he was careful to say he did not in the least believe. Upon this remark, the good priest gave a knowing wink, and said, he knew something on that point, which was better kept secret. 'I see,' observed the nobleman, 'you are inclined to humour the joke; but it is quite impossible it should be true.' 'Not so impossible as you imagine,' replied the curé, 'since I have now the register of the marriage in the house, which I can show you if you are incredulous.' The guest affecting not to be convinced, the priest, with an important air, brought forth from a cupboard the fatal book, and, with some difficulty—for the wine had begun

to produce its effect—pointed out the entry of the marriage. Upon seeing it, the nobleman confessed he could not now doubt the fact, but became thoughtful and moody. Observing this, the curé said he would bring out a bottle of wine which would soon put his melancholy to flight. This he did, but the good man himself was the first to succumb beneath its power. Leaning back in his easy chair, he yielded to sleep, and began, no doubt, to dream of mitres and scarlet hats. This was the decisive moment. The melancholy nobleman, having torn the leaf out of the register, folded it carefully, and put it into his pocket; after which he closed the book, roused the priest, and speedily took his leave, having abused the good man's hospitality, and ruined for ever the hopes of Dubois' wife. What reward this person met with, we forget; but it is to be hoped that he finished his career in the galleys. Dubois, however, became a cardinal, and assisted largely in bringing about the ruin of the French monarchy.

Living among such persons, it is clear that the Duchess of Orleans could never be in want of materials, with which to fill her letters, or render them piquante. It is to her credit that she made the most of these materials, and has left behind her some of the most amusing and instructive volumes in the whole collection of French memoirs. Unfortunately, they cannot be translated, the duchess's pen being much too cynical to find suitable expressions in the English language. We have brought them before our readers as containing a specimen of literature which is popular in Germany and in France, and also as a curious instance of the amusements of persons in the most exalted rank. There is no advantage that we are aware of in being ignorant of such matters; and we think it better that they should be known to English readers in this manner than in translations by writers who would transfer to our language all the objectionable passages, as well as those which we have given. We conceive it to be no small part of our duty in providing materials for literary recreation, occasionally to make selections of this kind, guarding with all care against passing the boundaries which separate the right from the wrong—the safe from the noxious—according to our Christian standard. It is by proceeding on this principle, rather than by eschewing the lighter regions of literature, that we hope to avoid, on the one hand, the extreme of intolerable dulness, and on the other, that familiarity with gilded vice which is all the more dangerous that, by not disgusting with its grossness, it prevents alarm, and works on the unconscious reader an amount of mischief which it is as difficult to calculate as it is impossible to erase.

ART. III.—*The Bible in many Tongues.* London: Religious Tract Society.

2. *Bible Triumphs.* A Jubilee Memorial. By Rev. T. Timpson. 12mo.

3. *The Bible of every Land.* 4to. London: Bagster. 1851.

4. *The Bible in India.* 8vo. Calcutta.

5. *Report of the Forty-ninth Anniversary of the British and Foreign Bible Society.*

6. *Jubilee Tracts relating to the British and Foreign Bible Society.* Nos. I.—X.

It has always appeared to us a remarkable phenomenon that it should have been left to the nineteenth century to commence a system of multiplying and distributing copies of the Scriptures in all languages, at all adequate to the wants of the human race. This omission is the more impressive when we remember what races of profound and fervent biblicists have lived in the world, or have consumed themselves with zeal, and yet never perceived what seems so very obvious to us—the vast means which a philanthropic association places at the disposal of the Christian scholar for imparting a copy of the word of God to remote nations, for the very knowledge of whose language and history we are indebted to the modern missionary. Nor is this neglect to have circulated a competent supply of copies of the Scriptures peculiar to one age or one country; for even the fathers of the Church, and those of them who made biblical studies their forte, never seem to have intended to multiply copies of God's word to any further extent at most than they had disciples. These disciples of the Christian faith were indeed of all nations; and hence we learn in various places of the works of Jerome and Origen, of early translations of the Bible into the Italic, the Syriac, the Æthiopic, the Coptic, and the Sahidic, as well as into the Arabic, the Mæso-Gothic, and the Armenian languages. But for the most part we are ignorant of the real authors of these early versions, though there can be little doubt of their existence; for, accustomed as we have ever been to the contemporary use of copies of the Scripture in our own tongue, from the first period of our religious sensations, it is difficult for us to understand how, in those furious ante-Constantinian times, men of so many different climes could have nurtured their piety to so great a height without the daily use of copies of Holy Writ. We imagine that Christians would in those days write out for their own use certain parts of the Bible, and at a time when books were rare even on

worldly topics, the habitude of men's minds must have been more independent of written records, and so the memory and the ear in those days perhaps were better cultivated than with us. And no doubt it was owing in great measure to that less extensive and less minutely accurate, or to that merely general knowledge of the Bible that we find so great a growth of the rankest heresies from the first to the end of the fourth century, and so feeble a spirit among even the believers in the biblical documents in developing the utter falsehood of novel and shallow beliefs, which, but for the extension of Mormonism among ourselves, we could scarcely credit to be tenable for an hour now, or to be owned by any except the entirely uneducated.

After the fourth century, when the spirit of antichrist was rapidly taking the papal form, we cease to wonder at the comparatively infrequent use of or appeal to the Scriptures that we find almost everywhere manifest in the movements of the churches; for saints had become the rivals of the prophets and the apostles, and of course their *pseudo* gospels, epistles, and apocalypses were in rising demand; and in dealing with heretic opinions we often find good and true men quoting books now unknown, or uttering sentiments at which one now smiles, while we are wondering why the champions for the truth did not quote the Scriptures boldly and at once. The truth is, the Scriptures were in those times much less known even by the teachers than they are now: writing, however good, is always difficult to read, at least for a long period; and, as entire copies of the Bible must have always been, while they depended on the pen, expensive articles, we can see at once why so many of our old MSS. only comprise parts of the Scriptures, and why polemic theologians have sometimes failed to quote passages which would have been most apt to the occasion.

Chrysostom, who lived in the fourth century, in his Second Homily on John, says, 'By the translation of the Scriptures into the native language of the Syrians, the Egyptians, the Indians, the Persians, and Ethiopians, who were formerly barbarians, the world had learned the true art of philosophizing;' while Theodoret, in the early part of the following century, makes a similar boast. For he observes, 'The Hebrew is not merely translated into the Greek, but also into the Roman and the Egyptian,' and he mentions too 'the Armenian, the Scythian, and the Sarmatian.' (Therap., Sermon 5.) Of the authors of these translations nothing satisfactory is now known. Nor does all ecclesiastic antiquity contain, that we know of, one single good book on the art of translation itself. From the fourth to the eighth century we are not aware of a single translation of the

Scriptures except one into the Georgian ; and, though in the age immediately preceding the Reformation there were many translations made of parts or the whole of Scripture into the French, the German, the Dutch, the Italian, the English and Spanish languages, for the most part they remained in MS. till the discovery of printing, one of those greatest arts which were born in heaven to re-organize the whole fabric of human society.

The works that stand at the head of this paper are of very different qualities. The last two, which are issued under the direction of the Earl-street Committee, make little pretension to authorship, and are published only as a part of the business operations of the society, with the exception of the Jubilee tractates, which are intended to bring before the Christian public a general summary of the labours and projects of the association. We recommend them to the careful perusal of those members of the various congregations of our common protestantism whose attention has hitherto not been sufficiently attracted to the claims of the Bible Society. 'The Bible in India' is a pamphlet written in that country, and is intended to show to how beneficial an extent the circulation of the Scriptures has already affected a considerable portion of the Indian population, to which the four hundred and three missionaries that labour there have no means of access. It is drawn up in a catholic spirit, and particularly points out to European Christians the great number of instances in which the mere reading of the word of God has led to the conversion of individuals. We quote the following from this tract which will interest our readers :—

'The Rev. C. Krauss, of Kishnagur, a few years ago related to the Calcutta Bible Association that a few months ago, there came to me an old man, a Muchi by profession, and of considerable property, with an old and much used copy of the Gospel of St. Matthew, carefully wrapt in a piece of cloth. Holding it in his hand, he said, 'Sir, a few years ago I met with this delightful book ; I have read it through and through, and the more I read in it, the more I am convinced of the truth of your religion. I am, therefore, anxious to obtain a larger book of your religion, as I perceive that there are such with you, and then, if you allow me, I will sit in your verandah and read it through all the day long. Your God shall be my God, and you shall be my teacher.' The narrator added, 'Since that time his sons keep him in a closet with his New Testament, and he is not allowed to come near me.'

The tract is filled with similar instances of the efficacy of the Scriptures alone to effect a thorough change in the heart of the Hindoos. 'The Bible Triumphs, is a Jubilee Memorial,' by Mr. Timpson, belonging to the industrious family of well-intended compilations to which its author and a large number of gentlemen who might have produced original works have devoted their at-

tention. This work will repay the perusal to all those who have not from other sources learned the history of the British and Foreign Bible Society. 'The Bible in many Tongues' is, we believe, the compilatory work of Dr. Angus, of Stepney College, and published by the Religious Tract Society, and, as a breviary of the larger subject, which is more scholastically dealt with by Mr. Bagster, it well deserves being made public. The little book of Dr. Angus is the contribution to the jubilee year of the Bible Society of a mind deeply imbued with the love of Oriental lore, but of which the author is modestly content to make no greater a display than is furnished by the few pages of 'The Bible in many Tongues.' We want both words, room, and time to speak adequately of the important 'Bible of every Land,' in 4to, by the house of Bagsters, to whose name modern biblical scholars are already so deeply indebted. It is indeed enough that the name of Bagster the publisher is as well known in the world of biblical literature now, as several of the time-honoured names of printers who lived at Paris, in Batavia, and at Amsterdam in particular, from two to three centuries ago; but the work of which we are speaking could only have appeared in our own age. We understand, indeed, the work is already out of print, so self-evident must have been its great advantages to that numerous body of biblical critics who are pursuing their knowledge of the Scriptures through the important medium of philologic analogy, or to the biblical amateurs who are merely desirous of gratifying their natural curiosity by examining the progressive fidelity with which our missionary translators have infused the sense of revelation into many languages which had no grammar till they made one, and could scarcely be pronounced a written language at all. 'The Bible of every Land' contains original specimens of all the languages into which the Scriptures have been translated, a brief history of the languages themselves, and most important historic notices of valuable labourers who at different periods had employed themselves in forwarding the translation of the Scriptures. The volume is especially rich in its department of Oriental translations, with which the great bulk of biblical scholars had remained, till our own age, almost generally unacquainted. We could heartily desire that a copy of this volume might be placed in every public library, which, indeed, as long as it lacks the boon, cannot be said to possess one of the most important works of the modern press.

The original writers of the Scriptures had the subjects presented to them without previous preparation; they had no philologic difficulties to overcome, nor had they any reason to be studious of their style; for they wrote as they were 'moved by the Holy Ghost,' or, in other words, as they were inspired. But

the translator, to all his other disadvantages, has to add the necessity under which he lies to understand the subject of which the sacred authors wrote, to study as well the genius of both the language from which he would translate and that into which it is his intention to convey the divine sense; and on no occasion may he depend on the divine superintendence which conducted the performances of prophets or apostolic men. The translation of the Scriptures is no ordinary enterprise; for whoever would undertake the labour should be a person in *moral harmony with the spirit of the authors*—should have a habitude of judgment, of competent self-controul, and be strongly penetrated by a profound deference to divine truth. A mere scholastic genius who believes the Bible to be a merely human production can never feel that sense of authority which belongs to every portion of the divine communications; and, destitute of the hallowed anxieties of which the life of biblical translators is so full, he—influenced chiefly by the hopes of human praise—would render the teachings of Christ and Moses with as little concern into a new language as he would the sentiments of Theocritus or Plato. So far from being actuated by a proud and over-confident reliance on the human faculties for his work, the translator of the Bible should possess a deep feeling of the liability of the best-constituted minds to go astray, and of the almost imperceptibly small occasions that are sufficient to induce the preference of error to truth. This sense of the inadequacy of our best powers for the work will force the translator into frequent habits of prayer; nor will he be ashamed to own his dependence on this source of illumination, as he can easily believe that God will as soon hearken to the wants of a literary servant of His as to those of a Christian who wants bread or health, defence from foes, or restoration to liberty. Besides the moral qualifications, the translator of the Bible should possess a sufficient amount of those that are literary. He should be so familiar with rabbinic learning as not to be carried off his guard by even such rare scholars as Reuchlin, Pagninus, Sebastian Munster, and old Buxtorf, who learned their views from those rabbinic teachers whose whole life had been spent in the conjectural interpretation of the Targums. On the other hand, our translator should not run wild into the other extreme of Forster, who, to guard against the follies of the rabbinites, thought a perfect knowledge of the Hebrew could be acquired from the sacred volume alone, and who was followed by Stockius, Gussetius, and others. The sound mindedness requisite to the translator will equally defend him from the follies of the Avennarian and the hieroglyphic schools, the former of which, from being too tenaciously attached to the idea that the Hebrew was the primitive language (vide his ‘*Liber Radicum*’), and the

latter embracing the cabbalistic system, which, by dealing with the Hebrew letters in the spirit of legerdemain, evokes from them almost every sense which the sciolist may determine. Of the vagaries of scholastic philology the translator is in constant peril; for, while Herman Vander Hardt recognises the Greek as the most ancient language, M. d'Olivet believes that the Hebrew is the pure idiom of the old Egyptian, such as it was spoken in the times of Joseph, and that all knowledge of the Hebrew has been lost for ages (!) and that to translate the books of Moses properly he would be obliged to render many of the passages into senses that would shock and astonish all our ideas!

Every translator of the word of God, in addition to possessing an accurate command of the critical language from which he translates, should be familiar with the various versions that have obtained celebrity in former times, which, from having been made at a date anterior to the greater part of the oldest manuscripts we now possess, must possess considerable authority in deciding the primitive condition of the text, and of course determining the value of the *variae lectiones*, though a wise translator must never forget either the time or place at which the version was made. It must be also remembered that although the old versions often figure in the pages of the commentators, they, as a body, have yet to be philologically criticised. Among the earliest of the versions is that of the Septuagint, which stood to the primitive Christians who could not read Hebrew in the character of the original Old Testament, and hence no doubt the reverence with which it was regarded. We ourselves care little for the opinions of either Rosenmuller or Bishop Horsley on the corrupted reputation which this version is supposed to possess. The greatest and most assiduous attention is due to its authority, and to it alone may often be attributed the safe clue to the disputed reading of the Hebrew Bible. The version of the Vulgate is every way inferior to that of the Septuagint, or even to some of the other Greek translations, but, whether the work which has so absolute an authority with the Roman Catholic Church owe its inferiority to the rapidity of its Jeronymian execution, or perhaps in part to later corruptions, we will not say, but we may certainly conclude that it is inferior to some of the older Latin versions that preceded the Vulgate.

Our translator should also be able to consult the authority of the ecclesiastical fathers. It would never become a good translator of the word of God to give too great a leaning even to the earliest and the best preserved of the fathers of the Church; for we all know from how eccentric a stand-point many of them viewed the Scriptures; nor must it be forgotten that in the greater number of instances the quotations of Scripture were

merely made from memory, and that before a period when the necessity for absolute accuracy of quotation had been generally received. As well as with the ancient versions our translator should also be familiar with the best of the modern translations of the Holy Scripture. The superiority of these, effected for the most part in an age when classical erudition was but half exhumed from the clay, will appear by comparing the English version of 1611 with the many that have been made since, whether made of parts, as Goode's book of Job, or the new translation of the Unitarians. Even the old version of Luther's German Bible will be attended with peculiar advantages to the translator in rendering some portions of the Scriptures, while from the works of Augusti and De Wette, and especially of that rare fund of philological science to be found in Gesenius's commentary, every translator would avail himself.

Omitting for the present the great importance of proper lexicons, critical commentaries, and concordances, &c., which may be necessary to the translator of the Scriptures, a translator of the Scriptures who aims at lasting utility and imperishable honour must also pay considerable attention to such universally-established canons of biblical criticism as inevitably bear on his object. According to Dahti, 'a translator must express the words of the original according to their true sense, without addition or abatement, agreeably to the language into which it is made, and without introducing into it modes of expression peculiar to the original. So that it can instantly and without difficulty be understood by those who understand no language but that of the translation, just as those understood the original for whose use it was made.' If this be true, then, a good translation must faithfully exhibit the sense of the original documents; and in doing this the translator has first to find the sense, to separate it from all ambiguity; but how can he be said to do either without the translator be ever faithful to every idea contained in the originals, and, in truth, to every ascending or descending modification of the sacred sense? Nor ought the translator to obtrude his own supernumerary ideas, or to give utterance to the sentiments of others in his work that are not in the original. A good translation must be literal without being slavish; free in spirit and in word, without licentiousness; not a mere paraphrase, nor something briefer even than the sacred writings; true, without being a mere verbal interchange; close, in opposition to a loose and languid style; simple as the talk of childhood, but rigidly correct as the enunciations of the geometer; the language and thought of the translation should be characterized by purity and energy, avoiding at the same time the either extremes of too great an air of antiquity or too near a re-

semblance to the polish of modern speech. It should be perspicuous whether the original be so or not, and there should be no discrepancy between one portion of the translation and another; uniform without monotony, and harmonious without an affected regard to the laws of rhythm. The terse idioms of the Hebrew and the Greek should be as rigidly preserved as possible, and in dealing with the various forms of figurative language with which the Scripture is overflowing, care should be taken to steer clear of the Sylla of a loose and indefinite phraseology, and of the Charybdis of too minute an imitation of orientalism.

Besides the above, the translator must be prepared to deal adequately with all the proper names of Scripture, with its anthropomorphic utterances, and by giving to the poetic, the historic, the prophetic, and the evangelistic portions of the hallowed records their appropriate attributes, yet preserve among the ubiquitous whole that fine spirit of uniform oneness which all the books of God must necessarily possess. He should ever bear in mind the influence which his translation will exert either to advance the reader in his search for the divine meaning or in hindering his progress. Nor to accomplish this end can the translator be indifferent to the customs and peculiar opinions that once prevailed among eastern nations; to their various views of chronology, natural history, meteorology, geography, and national history. And while he thus distributes his attention among all these topics, he must not forget that patient application to his own rules, and that frequent self-revision without which the translator will but ill prove that he is master of that dignified habit of mental sobriety which involves freedom from the prejudices of all the various schools of exegetical or popular theology. The peculiarities of the patriarchal, the Mosaic, and the Christian systems, the sects of the Jewish nation in the times of our Lord, and the reigning peculiarities of the Gentile world, so far as it was contemporaneous with the period in which the epistolary writings of the New Testament were produced, will be also necessary to a good translator of the word of God.

Now, the question occurs to us, were the translators of the Scriptures who have been employed or countenanced by the British and Foreign Bible Society men of this kind, or were they deficient either in the moral, the intellectual, or the scholastic qualities which we have thus conceived to be necessary to a translator? We believe for the most part in their aptitude for the great and the immortal works they have undertaken, and when the present generation is all extinct, and a purer age comes to the revision of their work, we believe that its verdict will be substantially like our own. It is, however, necessary that we

should lay before our readers a brief view of what the Earl-street Institution has effected in the first half century of its operations; but, while we can do this, so far as its own documentary evidence furnishes the means, those documents, extensive and extraordinary as they are, furnish but a feeble survey of the grand entirety of the influence of this Society, that has embraced all nations in its comprehensive benevolence. Not to dwell for the present on the prodigious share which our own nation primarily, and the European kingdoms in general, have received from the labours of this Society, who can help feeling a noble exultation at the extension of its devout and energetic designs to evangelize those hundreds of millions of the human family which people with their monosyllabic tongues the vast field spreading from the east of the Burrampooter, including the Burmese empire, and extending from Thibet north to Siam and Cambogia on the south, and throughout China, including all its eastern seaboard? These languages, indeed, are not very numerous, and are all based on the Chinese; but they branch themselves into two divisions—viz., the Indo-Chinese and the Thibetan. Of these, translations have been made into the Assamese, of the entire Bible; into the Munipoora, of the New Testament by Carey; into the Khossee, of the four Gospels and the Acts, though the whole of the New Testament is translated; into the Burmese, of the whole Scriptures by Dr. Judson of the American Bible Society and the Serampore Missionaries; and into the Siamese, of two Gospels by the same translators. And then for the Chinese empire itself, now the seat of as much civil war as the effeminate Chinamen can command, we have, by Drs. Morrison, Milne, Marshman, and Gutzlaff, the whole Bible printed, and at so low a price that the New Testament can be sold with a small profit for 4d. per copy; while the New Testament is also printed in the Manchou language by Lipoffzoff and Borrow. The Calmuc tongue now contains its version of the New Testament; and for Eastern Mongolia we also possess a printed copy of the entire Bible in the Buriat language, which, though spoken by less than 200,000 persons, is of immense value in its cognate relations to other tongues.

In a linguistic point of view, the near forty languages of a totally different class spoken throughout India present to the European and Christian scholar aspects of greater exhilaration still. Beginning with the Sanscrit, the great classical mother of all the Indian tongues, we now possess the whole Scriptures through the translations of Messrs. Carey, Yates and Wengar; and when we remember the extraordinary preference for this tongue among all the educated classes of India, its importance can scarcely be overrated. The Hindostanee, spoken by near thirty millions of

people, now possesses the entire Bible; but for this immense population the British and Foreign Bible Society and all other private resources have only printed 113,000 copies! To the Serampore missionaries, Northern and Central India is indebted for a translation of the Scriptures into the Bengali, spoken by at least 30,000,000 of people. The whole Bible also has been translated into the Orissa or Uriya language, which is spoken by 3,500,000; and for the upper provinces of Bengal, we have now the whole Bible translated into the Hinduwee, which spreads over a population of 25,000,000 souls. Translations have also been made of the whole or parts of the New Testament into the various languages of Central and Upper India, known to us by the names of the Bughelcundee, the Bruj, the Canoj, the Koshala, the Harrowkee, the Oojein, the Oodeypoor, the Merwur, the Juyapoor, the Bikeaneara, and the Buttaneer. Of the Sindhu, spoken by at least 10,000,000 persons we have a printed translation of parts of the New Testament; but in the Moulton dialect, spoken by 4,000,000, we possess only the New Testament. The Serampore missionaries have completed the translation of the entire Scriptures into the Punjabee, or the tongue of the Sikhs, who are reckoned at 10,000,000; and besides translations of parts of the Word of God into the Jumboo or Mountain Punjabee, and the Cashmerian, which prevails north of Lahore among three quarters of a million, the same brave and hallowed band of Christian linguists have produced for the 2,000,000 of the Nepaulese the New Testament, in addition to parts of it in the dialects called by the names of Gurwhal, Kumaon, and Palpa. Thirty-three thousand copies of entire or parts of the Scriptures are all that have been yet printed for the 10,000,000 of Telingese, in the Madras Presidency. For the 7,000,000 of inhabitants who occupy the Karnatic, parts of and the whole of the Scriptures have been printed, but in what numbers we are not able to inform our readers; but they may rest assured that it is only in proportion to the miserable 32,500 for the near 2,500,000 who occupy Travancore and Malabar and speak the Malayalim. And for the Presidency of Bombay, Christian, but chiefly missionary, scholars have printed in the Kunkuna, a dialect spoken by at least 1,000,000 of people, copies of the Pentateuch and the New Testament. The entire Bible has also been placed in the hands of the 3,500,000 who use the Mahratta; and, perfected by the extraordinary erudition and zeal of the Serampore scholars, God's Holy Word is now printed in the Gujerattee, which is vernacular to at least 5,000,000 of the inhabitants of India; while even for the little province of Cutch, not containing more than 50,000 persons, parts of the New Testament are already printed. And for the languages of Ceylon, British Christians have pro-

vided translations of the Scriptures both in the Pali (with Burmese character) and in the Indo-Portuguese.

Of the other Asiatic languages, in which the British and Foreign Bible Society have printed editions, we may mention 2000 copies of the Judeo-Arabic, in Hebrew characters, for the Israelites in various parts of the East; the Persic New Testament, by Henry Martyn, and the Old Testament, by Archdeacon Robinson, with portions of three other translations, in all 31,857 copies. For the use of the Affghans, above 4,000,000 in number, the historic books of Scripture and the New Testament; in the Pushtoo and in the Baloochee, three Gospels have also been printed. If we pass to the nations bordering on the Caucasus, we shall find translations of some of the Gospels in the Ossitinian, the New Testament in modern Armenian, and in the Ararat Armenian, as well as in the Trans-Caucasian, or Tartar tongue, we have St. Matthew's Gospel. The New Testament and the Psalms have been printed in the Caress or Turkish Tartar, as well as in the Orenburgh Tartar. Either the Gospels or the New Testament have been also published for the Finnish tribe, speaking the Ischereschian and the Isscheremissian dialects; while for three other Finnish tribes we have considerable editions in print, either of the Gospels or the New Testament.

For the people of Southern Europe, besides editions in Italian, Piedmontese, and modern Greek, we have to record 12,000 copies of the entire Bible in the Turkish, both in Greek and in Armenian character; and 14,000 copies have been distributed among the 6,750,000 of the people occupying Servia and Bulgaria, in their respective languages. The New Testament in Armenian and in the Catalan, and parts of or the entire of the New Testament in the dialect of the Spanish Basque (Escuara) have been long since issued by the Earl-street Institution, as well as in the Quanian or Norwegian Lapponese, the Faroese or old Icelandic, and in the Esquimaux language.

While the sympathies of the Bible Society have been thus active in behalf of the people of Asia and Europe, they have not overlooked the claims of dejected Africa, for the entire Bible has been printed in the Amharic for the use of Abyssinia; in the Berber, parts of the Gospels; in the Bullom and Mandingo, St. Matthew, as well as in the various tongues known to us of Europe by the names of the Accra, the Yomba, the Grebo, the Namarque, the Sechuana, and the Caffre, as well as in the Sesuto, various parts of the Scriptures have been published, and no doubt with many a beneficent historic result, which will never be revealed till the sea of memory gives up her dead.

And in addition to these incredible results, the labours of the Bible Society have extended their devout care to the wants of

the different people occupying the continent of America. We find a record of 2000 copies of parts of the Old Testament and the whole of the New in the Esquimaux, for the district of Labrador, and similar portions of Scripture are printed in the tongues called the Mohawk, the Mic-Mac, the Chippeway, the Delaware, the Choctaw, and the Dakota, for the use of those doomed and diminishing races the aboriginal Indians. And for South America the Bible Society has printed several editions of portions of the Scriptures in the negro dialect of Surinam and Dutch Guiana, and in the same dialect of Curaçoa; and in the Cinnara for the region of Bolivia, and in the Mexican of the Gospel of St. Luke.

We have indeed but one district more to mention, which is that of Polynesia, which probably covers as great a space as the locality of any other of the diversely scattered parts of the human family. Beginning with Malay, the Society has at different periods published 36,000 copies of the New Testament. For the Javanese the same part of Divine Truth has been translated, and though only 3500 copies of it have been circulated, the people themselves at least amount to 2,500,000. In the Dyak language the New Testament has also been published, and while we can only boast of the publication of the Gospel of John for the enormous and long overlooked population of Japan, a beginning of the good work has been at last made. Through the translation of Dr. Bettelheim, Luke and the Acts have but recently issued from the press in the dialect of Loochoo. The inhabitants of Hawaia, Tahiti, and Rarotonga have many copies of the whole Scriptures, through the learned and laborious zeal of the missionaries, in their respective languages. A version is now in a state of preparation for the Marquesas Islands, while the Tongan and Maori have other parts beside the New Testament in circulation. In the Malayese, also spoken by at least 4,700,000 persons, the entire Bible is translated, and 27,258 copies of it have been distributed already. The people using the Feejean may now read the New Testament in their vernacular language; and the inhabitants of Mare and New Caledonia will shortly enjoy a similar privilege, while in the Papuan language a portion of the Gospel is already printed.

It would, however, convey but an imperfect idea of the extent of the labours of the British and Foreign Bible Society, if we were to confine our attention to the works it has performed for those nations which are more or less severed from Europe by the inappreciable distance of speaking another language. It were but a poor consolation to the biblically indigent in France, Germany, and England to be told that our Bible Society had been the means of distributing 2,000,000 copies of the Scriptures in

the various languages of India, if we could not also show that it had not expended all its charities on foreign objects. Besides, however, issuing near 30,000,000 of copies of portions or of the entire of the Scriptures in 150 different languages, the Society has remembered the growing poverty of one large section of the community in a high state of civilization, the rapidity with which books are worn out among us, from fifteen to twenty per cent., and has issued or has caused to be issued, 16,023,266 copies of the Old or New Testament in the English language, 117,543 in Irish, 816,759 in Welsh, 143,645 in the Gaelic, and 7250 copies in the Manx language. And the following eight of the continental Bible Societies, all the daughters of our own, have issued—

' From the Swedish Bible Society	670,413	Copies.
„ Danish ditto	203,262	„
„ Netherlands ditto	487,911	„
„ Prussian ditto	1,694,620	„
„ Würtemberg ditto	623,515	„
„ Saxon ditto	218,400	„
„ Swiss Societies	719,719	„
„ Paris ditto	543,403	„

'In addition to these large issues, and a variety of private grants, not fewer than 800,000 copies of the German New Testament were furnished, at an early period, to some zealous individuals, for distribution; and a still larger number, both of Bibles and Testaments, have been circulated by those agencies of the Society hereafter to be noticed.'

Much, however, as has been effected, we must not forget what part of the work yet remains to be accomplished. Of the family of African languages, there are yet 201 into which the Scriptures have not been translated, 170 of the American; of the Polynesian, 62; of the Ugro-Tartarian, 39; of the Slavonic, 10; of the Indo-Chinese, 31; of the Monosyllabic, 13; of the Sanscrit, 23; of the Indo-European, 20; of the Græco-Latin branch, 10; and of the Celtic, 3 languages. What, however, are even these, compared with the table of languages as exhibited by Mons. Balbi or Adelung, the latter of whom reckons all the languages in the world to be no fewer than 3064, while the atlas of the former exhibits 800 languages and above 5000 dialects!

In reviewing, however, what has been effected, we would not monopolize to our Bible Society the whole credit of its wondrous achievement, for what could it have done without the coadjutory succour of the biblical scholars which have been found in every class of the modern missionaries? Nearly thirty of the agents of the London Missionary Society, ten belonging to America,

nine from the Wesleyan Society, and six of the Moravian Church have been employed in the department of translating the Scriptures; while a great number from the Baptist Society, the Church of England, and the Presbyterian Churches have also nobly shared the toil and are just claimants to a portion of the honour. We could indeed wish to see accomplished by some friend of the Bible Society who possesses a sufficient competence for the work, a history of all these new translations, in which their honoured authors would of course find their appropriate place; and if the work were undertaken by some one who would supply the public with the information which it would have an interest in receiving, we cannot doubt of its success. The difficulties, the invention, the frequent failures and the final success of the translators would be a laudable history; and as the Gospel must be translated into *all* languages before the people can be discipled to Christ, the sooner the business of translation is undertaken the better for all classes of genuine Christians.

Not only, however, has the judicious and fervent zeal of the Earl-street Institution shown itself in providing some 150 classical channels through which it can pour the pure word of God into the ears of discordant nations, but the Society has been equally wise in providing a large staff of distributors of copies of the Scriptures when printed. Of all the means that bid fair to extend the knowledge of the Bible, especially among people not ripe for its reception, we know of no set of agents so aptly qualified for the work as the well-adapted *colporteur*, or the Bible-hawker. It is true that any person might sell copies of the Scriptures, whether he believed their contents or not, but such an one is not the pious *colporteur* of the Bible Society. He is a man of tried and approved probity, who loves his work, can brave the perils incident upon it, is bold enough to climb the mountain abodes of scattered cottages, or to visit the nefarious dens of men of abandoned manners; and so strongly fortified by the power of the experimental knowledge he possesses of evangelic life, that he can either maintain his ground with the Jesuit priesthood, the talented scorner of the Christian hope, or with the arrant but wily advocate of atheistic notions. With his pack on his shoulders, our *colporteur* tracks all the footsteps of men to the country wake or fair, to the gala shows of higher life, to the barrack yard of the neglected soldier, to the tide of emigrants about to quit their native country for ever, to the rendezvous of the sailor, or to those scenes of recreation where citizens congregate to spend their time or their money. And many a cheering message does he bring home in return for his labours, while the gross amount of copies that find their way into circulation by these means seems all but incredible. France appears

to be the country in which the idea of distributing copies of Scripture by the agency of the colporteur was originated, and the Parisian Bible Society now employs eighty-four of these individuals, who carry copies of the Bible for sale into those circles of the infidelized population whose youth passed under the irreligious influence of the revolution. Seventy of these eighty-four agents are converts from the Roman Catholic sect, and are, by the circumstances of their own history, peculiarly adapted to wrestle with a people who have neither seen any other form of Christianity than the papal one, or who having long learned to distrust it, are found too often ignorant of any other alternative than that of infidelity. Gratifying instances are frequently occurring in which the result of the colporteur's visit is not merely a free sale of copies of Scripture, but a large number of converts who have renounced the errors of the papacy, or of many of those infidel opinions that are commonly held in France. Leaving the difficulties of political science to the wiser body of citizens, the humble-minded colporteur, whose average income in France does not exceed £56 per annum, gives himself entirely to the business of evangelizing his country by opening passages for the formation of biblical institutions, or by merely selling as many copies of the Scriptures as possible. But let none of our readers imagine the calling of a biblical colporteur to be a sinecure, for he is constantly subject to the most galling and inquisitorial surveillance of the police, the gendarme, or the garde-champêtre. The law gives to these officials the right to suspect every man who carries a pack of books, to search the colporteur wherever they may meet with him. Woe to the colporteur that should have in his possession the least work not recorded in his prefectoral authorization; instant imprisonment is his reward, and the luckless colporteur becomes liable to a civil suit, the end of which would be a certain fine. Nor is it easy to become, in France—the country where, above all others, distributors of the Bible, by men that love their work, are wanted—a licensed colporteur; for he must comply with the requirements of several laws, produce an attested copy of sundry testimonials, and after he have done all, be told, in the language of suspicion and malice, that he has been admitted to act as a colporteur. Monsieur de Pressensé justly observes of this employment:—

‘Add to these annoyances, the further one—as was recently the case—of being obliged to renew this authorization at the end of each fortnight; and to have, for this purpose, to make a long, expensive, and fatiguing journey, in order to reach the chief town in the district, where the business is rarely ever settled with despatch. Assuredly—I repeat it—to confront all these obstacles, it is necessary to have a heart filled with a firm and unshaken determination to accomplish the

work to be done. From this I conclude that, looking at the matter under this aspect, we now have an additional and unexceptionable proof that the vocation of our colporteurs is not an affair of taste or fancy, and that it is by no means an easy way of gaining a livelihood, to be preferred before all others; but rather that it is a calling from on high, to which the Lord has given them grace to respond for the advancement of his glory.'

It would be unjust to the colporteur himself not to exhibit one of the many proofs of even his incidental usefulness, which we quote from the communications of the gentleman just named to the secretaries of the parent institution in London.

'One colporteur relates that having, during the past month, been overtaken by a violent storm, he had to seek refuge in a solitary house, the first, indeed, to which he came on his road towards a village. He found two persons in the principal apartment; the one an aged female, occupied at her spinning-wheel, and seated by the side of a bed, where lay a young man, to all appearance very ill. "The Lord be with you," said the colporteur, on entering, "and may all His gracious dispensations conduce to your good!" The two persons raised their heads on hearing these words, their countenances beaming with joy. The young man at once replied to the salutation of the stranger in a similar strain, which proved to our friend that God had conducted him among brethren, and when this is the case acquaintances are soon formed, and the most complete familiarity is soon established. The colporteur thereupon gleaned the following particulars for his encouragement and edification. In the year 1849, a Bible colporteur was in that neighbourhood, and called from house to house in the village, where he was very badly received. In one house only did he find admittance: it was the one in which the colporteur now was. At that period it contained another inhabitant, the head of the family, which consisted of the father, the mother, and the young invalid. The father had witnessed the unfriendly reception which the seller of books had everywhere met with, and had also heard the refusal of the innkeeper to give him food and shelter. From compassion to the traveller, he offered to give him a bed for the night under his roof; and further, out of pure kindness, and not to send the traveller away empty-handed, they consented to buy a Bible of him, without, however, attaching much value to the purchase. Matters being thus settled, the stranger departed the next morning, much discouraged and very sad, but not without imploring the blessing of God on the hospitable dwelling where he had been so kindly received, and not without entreating its inhabitants to make a good use of the treasure which he had left in their hands—the Word of God. Some time afterwards the father was taken ill, and his illness kept him confined to a bed of suffering for several months, which he quitted only when his mortal remains were consigned to the tomb. His illness did not deprive him of the power to read; and to amuse himself he took up the large volume of the book-merchant. It was not long before he became so interested in it, and so affected by what he read, that from

morning to night he would do nought else. The Spirit of God became his schoolmaster; that is to say, the Bible converted his soul, causing it to pass from death unto life a short time previous to his body passing from life unto death. The Spirit of God did even more. He made the sick father the instrument of communicating spiritual health to the soul of the wife and the son; so much so, that when the former drew his last breath, exclaiming, "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation!"—those who surrounded him—his wife and his son—confessed that they had been illumined by the same light. The son, who communicated these details to our colporteur, and who, as I have already said, is in the last stage of consumption, which would not, perhaps, leave him many more days in the land of the living—said with the greatest serenity to the colporteur, "I feel that the moment of my departure is approaching; but I know in whom I believe. Jesus will, in the last struggle, be to me what He was to my dear father: He will be my rod and my staff; and it is with full confidence I can say to Him, 'Lord, into thy hands I commit my spirit.'" "Amen," added the aged mother; "and blessed be the Lord that we know 'that all things work together for good to those who love him.'"

The Bible Society has now been in operation sufficiently long to prove the goodness of its catholic foundation, and the great and growing need that exists for its beneficent influence; for its fundamental principle was evidently none of those pseudo and pretentious outflowings of benevolence, which, when first started, dazzle almost all minds, but that soon become impracticable of continuous operation. Such, perhaps, was the project of Henry IV. when he suggested the scheme of a jury of nations to try the real claims in any *casus belli*, and finally to disarm all the nations of Europe; and probably such has been the often projected scheme of turning all our penal punishments into merely reformatory processes of restoring the character of criminals. The Earl-street Institution, which sprung from the same benevolent source, aimed at an object which thwarted the interests of no one except such as believe it is dangerous to read the Scriptures; and though it was at first pelted with the ribald and profane scoffs of the mere makers of money, or those keener politicians who believe that it is easier to govern an ignorant than an enlightened nation, the Society rapidly grew into public confidence. Its catholic constitution was, no doubt, one of the important causes of its growth; and it is owing to it and other kindred Societies, framed on the same principle, that we now so commonly witness members of all religious parties taking an equal share in managing its affairs, and by looking at the Institution from their different and even somewhat hostile points of view commending its claims the more heartily to all sections of the Christian church. Long may that diversely accordant unanimity prevail! and however severely the ecclesi-

astic war may obtain between the sects of Christendom, or the advocates of opposing theories of doctrine and of Church government, may England never witness the fall of this noble Institution, until at least there be no more translations of the Scripture to make, and no masses of the European population unable to supply themselves with the Bible.

ART. IV.—*Narrative of a Journey Round the Dead Sea and in the Bible Lands.* By F. de Sauley, Member of the French Institute. Edited, with Notes, by Count Edward de Warren. In Two Volumes. 8vo. London: Richard Bentley. 1853.

ALTHOUGH these volumes relate to the East, that quarter of the world toward which all eyes are turned, their interest is derived from things far remote from those which now engross the public mind. Not only are the Ottoman and Russian empires mere powers of yesterday, in comparison with the states and cities which are here referred to, but ages ere the Assyrian kings had reared those stately palaces recently disintombed from the dust of centuries, the cities whose sites M. de Sauley visited had flourished, fallen, and been well nigh forgotten. 'New worlds have risen, we have lost old nations,' since the plain of the Pentapolis became a place of desolation. To think of it as the abode of human life, as a scene in which man pursued his course of business and of pleasure, as he does now for very similar objects and with perhaps exactly similar feelings, is to go back to that day when Abraham stood in the door of his tent to receive the visits of angels—to a time when his once mighty but now scattered and desolate race was only a thing of promise. The mind reverts to the sublime simplicity of the patriarch's life in the solitude of the young world's flowery pastures, and to those passages of it which exhibit the greatness and beauty of his character. We follow him in his return from the pursuit of the seven kings, we think of the anxiety which the choice of Lot must have awakened in his mind, of his earnest pleading that the doomed land in which the worldly-wise son of his brother had decreed to sojourn should be spared, and of that terrible day when its doom was executed, and the smoke of its destruction rolled towards him in the plain of Mamre. The sudden and swift demolition of Sodom and Gomorrah is one of the most terrible episodes of Scripture history. The manner in which it has been recorded has always seemed to us to indicate something more than the mind can adequately comprehend, and the

scene of it has for ages been invested with a more than ordinary degree of interest. That interest has, moreover, been of a kind consistent with the character of the event itself. In the plain of the Pentapolis almost every traveller has seen what he conceives to be unmistakable evidences that the curse which blasted its cities still hangs over their sites. The appearances of nature, which in other regions would never attract any attention, here assume a supernatural and portentous character. If a storm sweeps along the solitary shores of the Dead Sea, even the wandering Bedouin, whom the hot blasts and fierce whirlwinds of the desert cannot terrify, is struck with awe. So deeply and powerfully has the catastrophe which befel the cities of the plain affected the human mind, that the region in which they stood seems to have been looked at in its lurid light. Travellers with whom the marvellous has always been an indispensable element of interest, have not been sparing of fables and legends respecting the Dead Sea. No living thing, we have been told, could cross its waters or find a home in its depths ; nothing but sterility, dreary and dark, could be seen around its shores.

M. de Sauley has done a good deal to divest our minds of these shadowy terrors. To him the plain of the Pentapolis had long been an object of the deepest interest, and when a severe domestic calamity induced him to seek relief in the excitement of travel, he resolved to make the exploration of it the principal object of his journey to the East. Having obtained from the French government such assistance as enabled him to proceed upon his travels as a *savan*, accredited for a scientific mission, he set out along with one or two companions, making the examination of the shores of the Dead Sea his chief intention. He visited it twice, performing the journey to Jerusalem and exploring some of the more interesting localities there in the interval. On the occasion of his first visit to the shores of the Dead Sea, our author seems to have been so far persuaded that the general belief regarding the sites of the Pentapolitan cities was not founded on any good grounds. An examination of the Scriptural account of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, as well as the references to that event in the writings of heathen authors, had to some extent convinced him that the prevailing opinion as to the waters of the Asphaltic Lake having covered the sites of the destroyed cities was erroneous. His first sight of the region which had been painted in such dark colours by many travellers, had a considerable effect in shaking his faith in their general accuracy. Instead of the dreariness and desolation which they spoke of as characterizing the whole scene, he saw the waters of the Dead Sea rippling in the sunlight. Where he expected to find absolute barrenness and evidences of

complete natural deadness, he saw beautiful flowers and flocks of birds wheeling over the still and sunny waters. There was little in the aspect thus presented suggestive of the character which had been supposed to be so truly indicated by the name given to that solitary sea. Impressed with the conviction, then, that the cities of the plain were situated not in the region which the Dead Sea covers, but in its vicinity, he set to work in order, if possible, to discover something which would indicate where they stood. Experience had taught M. de Sauley that traditions common among the inhabitants of a district were, generally speaking, more to be relied on than the opinions of men who had visited that district for the first time and made up their minds regarding it upon a process of reasoning rather than upon evidence fairly and carefully obtained. He accordingly sought for the site of Sodom on a spot which is still known to the Bedouin Arabs by the name of Djebel Esdoun, or the Mountain of Sodom. On this spot, situated at the southern end of the Dead Sea, he found a huge mountain of salt, on which, after a most minute examination, he discovered distinct traces of buildings. As to these being the remains of a city, there could be no doubt; whether or not they were the remains of a city which existed subsequent to the destruction of Sodom, was with him a matter for farther investigation. The character of the whole region and the silence of history on the point led him to believe that no city had existed there since the destruction of Sodom, and the obvious traces of volcanic action at a very remote period strengthened him in the opinion that the buildings, of which traces still remained, were of great antiquity. Resorting to the Scripture narrative, he found that Lot's flight from Sodom to Zoar must have occupied a much shorter time than is generally supposed. It is said that 'when the morning arose the angels hastened Lot' out of the doomed city 'towards the mountain,' and 'the sun was risen upon the earth when Lot entered Zoar.' This, M. de Sauley thinks, considering the rapidity of an eastern sunrise, clearly indicates an interval during which only a few miles could be traversed. He found, then, at a distance of about three miles from the supposed site of Sodom and on the higher ground, a place known as Zoar or Zouera at the present day.

It is impossible to deny that the reasoning by which M. de Sauley supports his alleged discovery, is at least as plausible in its character as anything that has been said of localities respecting which we have so little to guide us. At the opposite end of the Asphaltic Lake, and at upwards of seventy miles from Djebel Esdoun, he found a vast heap of ruins bearing the name of Kharbet-Gouram, which he identifies as the site of Gomorrah. 'If this discovery is disputed,' says M. de Sauley, 'I beg my

gainsayers will be so obliging as to tell me what city, unless it be one contemporaneous with Gomorrah, if not Gomorrah itself, can have existed on the shore of the Dead Sea at a more recent period, without its being possible to find the slightest notice of it in either sacred or profane writings.' (p. 65.) This, it must be confessed, is a very fair challenge, and although it has been maintained that no city ever existed there, until it is met we feel bound to say that the evidence which our author brings forward in support of his opinion is entitled to some weight. The discovery of Zeboim, on the Moabitish side of the Dead Sea, and of Admah, near to Sodom, at the southern end, resulted to some extent from those we have referred to, and depends upon somewhat similar proof. We are aware that M. de Saulcy's attempts to fix the sites of the Pentapolitan cities have awakened a good deal of opposition among travellers and savans both in this country and in his own. It has been alleged, for example, that what he took to be the remains of buildings are merely stones that have been washed down to the shores of the Dead Sea by the flooding of the streams that flow into it, and that he has allowed himself to be duped by his Arab guides, who never hesitate to suit their information to the traveller's wishes when they are well paid for doing so. We confess, however, that we see very little in the reasoning upon which M. de Saulcy's opponents proceed. His conjectures, if they are nothing else, are, at least, as plausible as theirs, and the grounds of them are not one whit less reasonable. While we must, therefore, accept of his statements with a certain degree of caution, we have seen little or nothing in those of others to render them improbable.

Some of our author's travelling companions were, like himself, zealous archæologists, men of ripe scholarship and high scientific attainments. The Abbé Michon, whose name must now be familiar to those who know anything about the living scholars of France, was one of them, and every member of the party seems to have been animated with a spirit akin to that which prompted M. de Saulcy to prosecute his interesting and often arduous investigations. In the course of their journey through the Holy Land, the travellers had their full share of the adventures and dangers connected with a sojourn in the now thinly-peopled deserts of Palestine. At one time they had to encounter the risks arising from an imperfect knowledge of topography, at another they were kept in jeopardy by the known proximity of wandering Arab robbers, while they experienced all the disagreeables and annoyances arising from the poverty and cupidity of the people with whom they had occasion to come in contact. The volumes before us are more especially interesting, however, for the supposed results of the investigations made, and we there-

fore pass over the ordinary incidents of travel in order to notice the more important of them.

After leaving the shores of the Dead Sea, the indefatigable band of Frenchmen repaired to the Holy City, where they anticipated meeting some of their countrymen who had preceded them. Whether or not we consider M. de Sauley's researches in and around Jerusalem to have resulted in anything worthy of being called a discovery, they were of a very interesting character. Making all due allowance for archæological enthusiasm and credulity, we are disposed to think that discoveries of some importance were made in the course of his investigations. There is no reason to doubt that his careful and long-continued examination of that portion of the Holy City within which the Mosque of Omar and the Hahrem now stand resulted in a discovery of a large portion of the wall of Solomon's Temple. In prosecuting his investigations in this case, M. de Sauley enjoyed advantages which have not been within the reach of many travellers. He obtained access to places from which the construction and direction of what has long been supposed to be a portion of the Temple wall could be easily seen. Comparing one part with another he perceived that the style varied very considerably, and was led to the conclusion that remains of the Solomonian wall still existed from a pretty extensive acquaintance with the structure of the oldest buildings in and around Jerusalem, as well as the difference existing between what he has been led to consider part of Solomon's Temple and the architectural remains of Herod's time.

A much more interesting investigation was however made by M. de Sauley in the environs of the Holy City. The wall of the Temple has long been supposed to exist in larger portions than some travellers have been able to trace; but in the course of his observations around Jerusalem our author examined the interior of a building, which, on evidence of some weight, he conceives to be the Tomb of David. This building, which has been one of great magnificence, is situated about five hundred yards from the Damascus gate, and is generally known as the Qbour-el-Molouk, or Tomb of the Kings. Its vaults have been often described, but the descriptions given of them seem all to have proceeded upon a merely cursory examination of their structure. It has been supposed by not a few that the tradition which assigns to this mausoleum the name it generally bears, is, like the one regarding the tomb of Moses, and many other localities, of no value. David, it is thought, was buried on Mount Zion, and from the style of architecture in this building it has been supposed by most modern writers to belong to a much more recent date. Some have identified it with the tomb of Queen Helena, but that princess

and her son were interred together, and in the Qbour-el-Molouk there are more than two sepulchres. Chateaubriand and others, who have pronounced this building to be the tomb of Helena, forgot that Josephus describes it as having three pyramids, and as being entirely different from the one known as the Tombs of the Kings. Is the designation which tradition has assigned to this building the correct one then after all? Is it to be supposed that what has long been regarded as a name given without any reason for its application, is really the right one? M. de Sauley is at great pains to ascertain this. He gives us what we must regard as very satisfactory evidence, that these 'tombs' are not the tombs of Herod's family, nor of the Asmonean kings, nor, as some have imagined, belonging to the monument of Alexander Jannes. He brings history, both sacred and profane, to bear upon the question so far as to clear it of the mistakes which have been made by other travellers, and then proceeds to inquire into the probability of this being really the building in which are to be found the tombs of the kings of Judah. After examining the different passages in the historical books of the Old Testament which refer to the death and burial of the kings of Judah, M. de Sauley finds that eleven monarchs and the high priest, Jehoiada, were interred in the royal sepulchres, while three others—namely, Jehoram, Joash, and Uzziah, prepared for themselves sepulchres beside those of their predecessors, but were not buried in them. Now, as we have already said, M. de Sauley found that the number of tombs in this mausoleum corresponded exactly with the number of the kings who had been buried, or had selected for themselves places of sepulture there. What appears to be a very conclusive argument against the royal sepulchres being on Mount Zion, that is, within the city, is found in the statement made in 2 Chronicles xxvi. 23: 'Uzziah slept with his fathers, and they buried him with his fathers, in the field of the burial which belonged to the kings, for they said he is a leper.' The inference from this passage clearly is, that the royal tombs were in a field, and not within the city. In addition to this, we know that the prescriptions of the Jewish law, as well as the customs of the people, were entirely opposed to burial near their habitations. If the number of sepulchres which M. de Sauley found in the 'tombs of the kings,' coincided with the facts of history, so as to render it probable enough that the building he explored was really that in which David and his line were interred, the arrangement of the sepulchres tended greatly to confirm him in that opinion. We cannot go into the lengthened statement which he gives as the result of his most minute examination of the structure. Suffice it to say, that one portion of it bore traces of having been prepared at a much earlier period than the others,

and of having been designed moreover to be kept separate from the other tombs. The character of this chamber, taken in connexion with the evidence he brought to bear upon the subject, led M. de Saulcy to suppose that this was really the tomb of David. In it he found a portion of the lid of a sarcophagus, elaborately ornamented with a floral device of a very ancient style. The state of the tomb, and the approaches to it, convinced him that it had never been fully explored before, and he therefore regarded the relic of antiquity thus discovered with no ordinary interest. That it really was a portion of the sarcophagus in which the dust of Israel's shepherd king once reposed, is a point on which there is nothing like direct evidence. It was undoubtedly of great antiquity, however, and possesses considerable interest as showing the progress which the Jews had then made in the arts of design.

M. de Saulcy occupied himself during his sojourn in Jerusalem in carefully examining most of the tombs in the Valley of Jehoshaphat as well as the places of interest within the city. The light which his narrative throws upon many parts of Scripture history renders his volumes very valuable. Though not devoid of that credulity which is said to belong to most antiquarians, it is only justice to say that his mind was little prejudiced by so-called discoveries made at earlier periods, and that he jealously scrutinized and carefully weighed all the statements on which his conclusions were founded. He has succeeded, of course, in exploding not a few mistaken notions respecting the identity of places still existing with those mentioned in Scripture, and he has also divested of fabulous associations many localities to which a sacred interest will ever attach. After leaving Jerusalem, M. de Saulcy examined the remains of the temple on Mount Gehrezin, and discovered what he conceived to be the ancient wall enclosing the structure reared by Sanballat. He then pursued his course towards the deserts of Canaan, and reached an enormous extent of ruins—the remains, as he supposes, of Hazor, the ancient capital of the Canaanite kings.

‘On our leaving El-Khan,’ he says, ‘we marched for a considerable distance through continuous ruins, then the patches (if I may use such an expression) of large unhewn blocks became few and far distant, until they disappeared altogether. We had then passed the extreme limit of the Cyclopean city, which I propose to consider as being the Hazor that was first burnt by Joshua, and definitively reduced by Nebuchadnezzar to the state in which we now behold it. Generally towards this limit of the ancient city, whenever we reach a well-sized mound, we may be sure beforehand that it will be covered with these strange ruins of a city of giants. I confess when on the spot a thought struck me that a place constructed with materials of such enormous

proportions could only have been the abode of an extinct race, resembling that of the Anakims, the Emims, and the Rephaims, which we find expressly mentioned in the Holy Scriptures. I firmly believe that this is the ancient capital of the Canaanites, a metropolis built long before the days of Moses, and destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar.'—pp. 528-529.

Such, then, are some of the more remarkable investigations made by M. de Saulcy in the Holy Land. Discoveries they certainly must be considered, whether the history of the localities is distinctly traced or not, and whether we accept his opinions respecting them or not. In the case of those vast ruins which are considered to be those of Hazor, for example, the evidence by which they are sought to be identified with the capital of Canaan is of a somewhat hypothetical character; but their antiquity is beyond all doubt. Any one conversant with the history of Palestine and the races by which it has been inhabited or invaded, may arrive at just conclusions on that point. If it is proved, and it can be proved by a reference to history, that such ruins have nothing about them indicating that they belong to any period of which we have written records apart from the Scriptures, the inference that they are of remote antiquity is, we conceive, a very just one. It is by a process of reasoning analogous to this, and through an extensive acquaintance with the minutiae of ancient history, so to speak, that M. de Saulcy has arrived at his conclusions. To the student of history, and especially of Scriptural history, the narrative of his travels cannot fail to be interesting.

ART. V.—*Protestant Persecutions in Switzerland and Germany. Results of an Investigation into Cases of Protestant Persecution on the Continent; undertaken at the instance of the Executive Committee for the Vindication and Promotion of Religious Liberty recently constituted by the Homburg Conference.* By the Rev. T. R. Brooke, B.A., Rector of Avening; and the Rev. Edward Steane, D.D., one of the Honorary Secretaries of the Conference. To which are added the Minutes of the Homburg Conference. London: Partridge, Oakey, and Co. 1854.

2. *Evangelical Christendom*, February, 1854. Article on Religious Liberty in Germany. By the Rev. Theodore Plitt, Professor of Theology and Ecclesiastical Law in the University of Heidelberg. London: Partridge, Oakey, and Co.
3. *Die Verhandlungen des sechsten Deutschen Evangelischen Kirchentages, zu Berlin im September, 1853.* (Report of the Sixth Assembly of the German Evangelical Churches, held at Berlin, in September, 1853.) Berlin. 1853.
4. *Religious Liberty in Germany.* A Letter to the Assembly of the German Evangelical Churches. By the Rev. G. W. Lehmann, Pastor of the Baptist Church at Berlin. Translated from the German by the Rev. B. P. Pratten. London: Houlston and Stoneman.
5. *Lettre adressée à M. le Prof. Merle d'Aubigné, sur le Principe de la Liberté Religieuse telle qu'on l'entend en Allemagne. Par un Membre de la Deputation en Toscane.* (A Letter to Professor Merle d'Aubigné, on the Principle of Religious Liberty, as it is understood in Germany. By a Member of the Deputation to Tuscany.) Neufchatel. 1854.

It will be long before the European Christian public, either on the Continent or in England, will have forgotten the sensation which was produced by the imprisonment of Francesco and Rosa Madiari, or the combined interposition, at once of political and of Christian influences, which ultimately led to the opening of the Tuscan dungeons. The public, however, beyond a very limited portion of it, does not yet know that out of the measures then taken ulterior proceedings have arisen, of wider hope and of greater promise. The general—or as, from its catholic character, it was termed the ecumenical—deputation sent from various parts of Europe to Florence upon that occasion, did not disperse without drawing up a paper of considerable importance, at once directing the attention of those who had sent them to the

numerous cases of religious persecution yet unrelieved, and offering grave suggestions for the adoption of more comprehensive measures. This document is not as yet, we believe, laid before the public ; but it is in reality the basis of all that has followed in this direction, as appears by the first sentence of the following extract :—

‘Acting upon the views expressed by the Ecumenical Deputation, sent to Florence in October, 1852, a few Christians from different countries met at Homburg, in fraternal conference, on the 23rd, 24th, and 25th of August, 1853, to consider what steps it might be proper to take for the promotion of religious liberty.

‘The conference was composed of nineteen members :—

ENGLAND—The Earl of Shaftesbury
President ;
Sir Culling E. Eardley,
Bart. ;
Rev. J. S. Blackwood,
LL.D. ;
Rev. T. R. Brooke ;
Rev. E. Steane, D.D.,
Secretary ;
G. H. H. Oliphant, Esq. ;
J. Macgregor, Esq. ;
GERMANY—The Rev. Professor Tho-
luck, D.D., of Halle ;
Rev. L. Bonnet and K.
Sudhoff, of Frankfort ;
Rev. Th. Plitt, of Heidel-
berg ;

GERMANY—Rev. L. Leuthold, of Frie-
derichsdorf ;
Rev. — Humbert, of Dorn-
holzausen.

FRANCE — Rev. C. Cook, D.D., of
Nismes ;
Rev. L. Goguel, of Sainte
Marie aux Mines ;
Rev. Frederic Monod, Se-
cretary ;
Rev. Adolphe Monod, of
Paris.

SWITZERLAND—The Rev. S. Prieswerk,
D.D., of Bâle ;
M. Adrien Naville, of
Geneva.

Homburg, the capital of the little principality of Hesse Homburg, is one of the gayest towns in Germany, and, during the last twelve years, has become a principal centre of fashion and dissipation for almost all Europe. For the sake of a large annual rental—something about £10,000 sterling per annum—the reigning prince has contracted with a company of speculators, who, reckoning on the frivolity of the age, have erected magnificent saloons, laid out beautiful walks, and constructed splendid baths, in the most spirited manner, providing for balls and promenades, for invalids and gamblers. And they have had their reward. Homburg is, as we have said, one of the gayest towns—we might say, perhaps, the gayest town in Germany. What could the ‘nineteen’—or, as we count them, the eighteen gentlemen named above, have in common with the frequenters of such a scene ? In truth, they had nothing in common with them, and it was for that very reason that they went there. They went there that they might be lost in the crowd, that they might be alone, that their meeting might appear to be, what it was in reality, a ‘fraternal conference,’ and might not be supposed to be, what it really was not, a political council.

Here, then, on the 23rd of August, 1853, amidst the din of musical performers, and the hum of fashionable promenaders, met these eighteen men—or nineteen, as the case may be—of devout character and eminent station, gathered from the face of almost all Europe, ‘to consider what steps it might be proper to take for the vindication and promotion of religious liberty.’ It was a noble thought, and not without occasion, as they deeply, and upon an interchange of sentiment, found that they unanimously felt.

Before, however, we proceed to notice the progress and issue of their deliberations, let us pay some attention to the facts on which they were founded. The interposition made on behalf of the Madiari had given rise to a strong and perfect conviction that there were, not only in Italy, but throughout Europe, many other victims of religious intolerance besides these, and that not only papal, but protestant powers were implicated in proceedings having the unquestionable character of persecution. These things, however, were known only by report, or by means of private letters, and it was found difficult, and, indeed, impossible, to arrive at the facts in any authenticated form; there being on the continent no freedom of the press, by virtue of which statements could be brought before the public, challenging inquiry and contradiction. Taking advantage of this state of things, it had become the custom of all functionaries, from the highest to the lowest, to ignore the facts altogether, and, if any inquiry was made in reference to them, to say, with the utmost nonchalance, that the whole must be a mistake, as no such things had ever taken place. We know that the British Government had been in this manner imposed upon, on referring some complaints made in this country to diplomatic persons in Germany. It was necessary that this method of pooh-poohing religious persecution should be broken up; and, accordingly, one of the measures adopted by the Homburg Conference was to send some of their own members to make inquiry, on the spot, into the cases of alleged hardship which had been brought before them; and to ascertain the facts from the highest authorities they could reach. The Rev. R. Brooke, rector of Avening, and the Rev. Dr. Steane, of Camberwell, kindly accepted this duty, and they spent several weeks in the performance of it, enduring considerable fatigue, and manifesting a large amount of Christian courage and sympathy. It is their report of this journey, presented on the 22nd of November last, to the executive committee appointed in virtue of the Homburg Conference, which is now in our hands, and from which we shall proceed to make a few extracts.

Our first extract makes due acknowledgments to the diplomatic and other persons from whom assistance was derived.

‘Being furnished with introductions for the purpose from our noble president the Earl of Shaftesbury, and one of us with a letter also from the Right Honourable the Earl of Clarendon, her Majesty’s Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, we waited upon Sir Alexander Malet, Bart., at Frankfort; Lord Bloomfield, at Berlin; and, after his lordship left that city, upon Lord Augustus Loftus, Chargé d’Affaires in his absence, and the Hon. J. D. Bligh, at Hanover; making them acquainted with the proceedings of the Homburg Conference, and with the mission which we had received from it. To each of these noblemen and gentlemen we are indebted for great courtesy, and for the readiness with which they furnished us with the letters we requested. Our acknowledgments are also due to Donald Cameron, Esq., Secretary to the British Legation at Berne, who, in the absence of Mr. Christie, Chargé d’Affaires, rendered us essential service. Nor can we omit to mention the valuable assistance of M. Eschenburg, professor of English in the University of Zurich, and of the Rev. G. W. Lehmann, of Berlin.’—‘Protestant Persecutions,’ p. 3.

The specific cases of alleged outrage into which the deputation examined were seven; one at Zurich, in Switzerland, one at Hilburghausen, in the duchy of Saxe Meiningen, one at Hersfeld, in Hesse Cassel, one at Ludwigslust, in Mecklenburg Schwerin, one at Bückeburg, in the principality of Schaumburg-Lippe, one at Bayreuth, in Bavaria, and one in the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein. It will thus be seen that the spirit of intolerance spreads its dark wings across the whole of protestant Europe from north to south—from Switzerland to Denmark—and it is known that Sweden is no exception to its rule. The inquiries of the deputation resulted in all cases in verifying the statements which had been previously made, and in authenticating them by references to the highest functionaries. Let our readers take a sample or two of the facts ascertained. Here is one of them.

‘In the town of Hilburghausen, formerly the capital of the Saxon duchy of that name, which is now united with the duchy of Saxe Meiningen, is a small Baptist congregation, not having a resident pastor, but forming a branch of the Baptist church at Hersfeld, in Hesse Cassel, under the superintendence of Mr. Beyebach, a Baptist missionary, stationed there. They are suffering under severe restrictions, so much so that a decree has been issued by the Supreme Government absolutely prohibiting their meetings, the circulation of tracts, and the administration of the sacraments; interdicting the visits of their pastor, and subjecting by name the chief person among them to a specified penalty if he receives them into his house. These prohibitions are enforced by fines or imprisonment, and the magistrates and gendarmes are charged to watch vigilantly against any infraction of them, and to lay immediate information, if any such case occur, before the state attorney. We saw some of these persecuted people, and received from them such an account of the manner

in which they stealthily hold their assemblies for Divine worship, as strongly reminded us of similar scenes and events related in the religious history of our own country. On one occasion, after having administered the ordinance of baptism, their pastor had a narrow escape from being captured by the police, and his little flock were scattered without being able, as they had intended, to celebrate the Lord's supper. Some time afterwards he ventured to visit them again. One of the members went to meet him at three hours' distance, and conduct him by paths lying out of the direct road, and through the Prussian territory, to the appointed place where the others were to await his arrival. It was at ten o'clock on a dark and rainy night when they all met on the side of a hill in the depths of a pine forest, to show forth the death of Christ, "Our table," says the good man who put the written statement into our hands, "was the mossy turf. I spread that table with a white cloth. How beautiful did the cup of the Lord appear upon it, while a few stars looked down from a clouded sky! It was so dark in the gloom of the forest that we could scarcely see the bread. But our hearts were the more full of joy as we had so long missed this sacred privilege. In commemorating our Lord's death he had strengthened our faith and love, and we joined in a song in the loneliness of a night in the forest."

'The communion over, the pastor dared not enter into the town, but, taking leave of his flock, he set off under the same friendly escort that had guided him to the spot where they were assembled on his return to Hersfeld. "We walked all night," the narrative proceeds, "when we came at length to a large water, and, fearing to fall into it, we stopped, taking shelter under an umbrella from the heavy rain. At daybreak we continued our course, and had to use great caution to escape being observed by the country people in the fields."—*Ibid.* p. 6.

Here is another, in the electorate of Hesse Cassel.

'In this electorate the intolerance is, if possible, still greater than in the preceding case. All religious meetings and ministerial functions are rigorously interdicted to the Baptists, and they are kept in a state of constant apprehension and alarm. Our attention was particularly directed to the state of things at Hersfeld. Here Mr. Beyebach resides, whose name has been already mentioned. He had been summoned before the authorities under the following circumstances:—On the 5th of May last, he was sitting with some of his friends in his garden at the back of his house, reading to them an account of the sufferings of the Madias, from the Journal of the German branch of the Evangelical Alliance, published at Berlin, when a policeman appeared and dispersed them. Strict inquiries were subsequently instituted at the houses of various members of his church, to ascertain where their meetings are usually held. On the 16th of the same month, a Christian sister was sitting in Mr. Beyebach's house reading a hymn book; again a policeman appeared, and though not another person was present, he insisted that there was a religious meeting. They remonstrated, but to no purpose; and, finally, he declared that as she was reading a religious book that was a religious meeting. Four days afterwards, on the 20th, Mr. Beyebach was cited before the Landrath,

who accosted him, angrily, as a rebel, whom he had the power to deliver up at once to a court-martial, but added, that, as in other respects he and his friends were orderly people, he should act more leniently. He then required him to give in a list of all the members of his church, and they were severally informed, by a serjeant of police, that they were forbidden, under a penalty of five dollars, or three days' imprisonment, to meet any of their friends for religious purposes. Under such a state of things the public and social exercises of religion are, of course, impossible, except as they may take place by night, or in secret places where the vigilant eyes of the police can be evaded.'—*Ibid.* p. 9.

We must content ourselves with one example more, which occurred at Ludwigslust, in Mecklenburg Schwerin:—

'On the morning of the 24th of February last, three officers presented themselves at the house of Mr. Wegener, the Baptist missionary residing there, bringing with them a search warrant. Having made their perquisition, they took away with them a number of books, the church records and seal, the communion plate, and several private letters. The next morning they came again, and repeated the search; boxes and cupboards were ransacked, and about a thousand religious tracts, eight Bibles, and a quantity of other books, among which were Baxter's "Saints' Rest," Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress" and "Holy War," and "Memoirs of Mrs. Judson," were packed in baskets brought for the purpose, and carried off. In the afternoon of the same day, Mr. Wegener was cited before the authorities, and told by them that they were acting in what they had done under instructions from the highest quarters; that he and his congregation were not acknowledged by the State, and would not be permitted to celebrate Divine worship, and that he ought to obey the laws, and not act in violation of them. The missionary replied that he had always lived as a good subject, and had honoured the magistrates; that neither he nor his friends had ever spoken or done anything against the government; that they created no disturbance, but worshipped God peaceably; and that their only wish was to make the Gospel known among their fellow-creatures. He was finally told that there was only one alternative, submission or emigration, and was then dismissed. On the 19th of May he was apprehended, and sentenced to fourteen days' imprisonment, every other day on bread and water, for having administered Christian ordinances.'—*Ibid.* pp. 12, 13.

It may be thought incredible, perhaps, that measures so arbitrary and severe should be taken against any persons on the score of religion merely, without their being in some other way obnoxious to censure. Upon this point, however, the deputation very properly made in all cases the strictest inquiry, and they uniformly received the most satisfactory answers. Thus at Schwerin, in the interview which the deputation had with the prime minister, Count von Bülow, they tell us—'We inquired if there was any other ground of complaint against the Baptists. He replied none whatever. He said also that he personally knew

some of them, and respected them for their excellent character, and that he believed they were generally sincere Christians, "to whom (he added) I can cordially extend the hand of Christian fellowship, as partakers with me of the true faith of the gospel, as I wish to do to all real believers." (Ibid. p. 17.)

And a similar testimony was borne even by his excellency M. Hassenpflug, the prime minister of Hesse Cassel, whose arbitrary spirit was the most intense, and carried him to a pitch of personal rudeness, which the deputation have felt themselves obliged to characterize in terms of unusual strength.

That deeds such as these narratives disclose (and we have given but a sample of them) will be responded to by a sentiment of deep and amazed indignation on the part of the entire English people, we cannot for a moment question. They want but to be brought to light to do their work; and we think that a most important service has been rendered to the cause of religious liberty in Europe, by putting them into a form in which they can no longer be either ignored or denied. Let the well-intentioned residents of Germany, who have hitherto been incredulous of these things, know what is really done at their very doors; let the snug police functionaries, who wonder at their doings being heard of so far off, understand that they are both well known and duly estimated in England; let ministers of state and ambassadors, both foreign and English, be convinced that these facts can no longer be concealed by artful underlings, who will not tell them the truth. Princes and gentlemen all! the murder is out, and be assured that public reprehension will follow.

It is one of the most mortifying and astounding aspects of these facts, that they occur, not in Papal, but in Protestant countries. That the hand of Romanists should be lifted up against Protestants we can understand while we condemn, and we know why the *Madiai* were arrested and imprisoned at Florence; but that the hands of Protestants should be lifted up against Protestants is too flagrant. It is too bad that conscientious men should have to fight over again the battle that Luther fought, in the land where he not only fought, but conquered.

To return, however, to the Homburg Conference. With a group of such facts before them they proceeded to deliberate; and being unanimous in their opinion that a 'necessity for organizing a common action in favour of religious liberty' did exist, they went on to inquire, 'What are the principles on which such an organization should be based, and within what limits should its operations be restrained?' The principles on which the organization should be based are laid down in the following sentences, which we lay with pleasure before our readers:—

‘I. That desiring earnestly to bear witness to the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to fulfil the obligations of that brotherly love which unites the members of His body to each other:

‘And further, considering that it is the right of every man to worship God, as well publicly as in private, according to his conscience, and to propagate the faith which he holds, by every means not contrary to morals or good order, or to that obedience to Government which is enjoined in the Word of God:

‘This Conference determines, in humble reliance upon His grace, to assist those of their brethren in Christ who suffer persecution for worshipping God, for disseminating their religious principles, or for reading or distributing His Holy Word.’—*Ibid.* p. 61.

An attentive perusal of these sentences will probably suggest to a reflecting reader that they were not formed entirely under the influence of the English spirit. We ourselves, for example, and many others with us, should have been apt to begin by laying it down as the right and duty of every man to judge for himself in religious matters, and then to go on to the special sympathy due to our Christian brethren. But this mode of viewing things is, it seems, peculiarly English, and does not prevail, even among the most enlightened Christians, on the continent. It was in deference to the continental spirit, we doubt not, that there was placed first in their resolution the importance of recognising true piety wherever it appears, and of fulfilling the obligations of brotherly love, a mode of which we make no complaint; only we are very happy to see in company with this sentiment, although in a subordinate position, the more expanded truth, that ‘it is the right of every man to worship God, as well publicly as in private, according to his conscience, and to propagate the faith which he holds by every means not contrary to morals or good order.’ This, in our judgment, is one of the great lessons which Protestant Europe has to learn, although one from which at present the German religious mind, even in its most advanced forms, violently recoils.

A direct and striking evidence of this is supplied in the last of the pamphlets with which we have prefaced this article,—a Letter to Professor Merle D’Aubigné on the principle of Religious Liberty as it is understood in Germany. This, although a small, is a significant and important utterance of German sentiment. It is understood to be from the pen of the Count Albert de Pourtales, a Prussian nobleman of great piety, as well as of high social and diplomatic position, and it is directed explicitly against the clause of the Homburg resolutions which we have just recited, a clause already the parent of a European controversy.

It is not for us to take upon ourselves to answer the arguments adduced by this much respected writer, to whom, no doubt, Dr.

Merle D'Aubigné will reply in a manner equally courteous and effective; we merely say in passing, that, after perusing them, we remain unchanged. The ground he takes is defined in the following sentence:—‘As a citizen I can plead the cause of civil, political, and religious liberty, and labour for its advancement. As an Evangelical Christian, I demand only liberty for the Gospel.’

‘Liberty for the gospel;’ yes, that is all that is to be asked for by evangelical Christians, and it is all that the evangelical churches of Germany can entertain any thought of granting. Hence, when the question of the treatment of sectaries was mooted at the late meeting of the Kirchentag at Berlin, it had respect only to such sectaries as must be regarded as Christian brethren, no question respecting those of another class being allowed to exist. It is thus out of a good feeling that this advocacy of a restricted liberty grows. The better the man is the more jealous he is lest liberty, if it were not fettered by the police, should be abused; and the only party demanding unlimited freedom is the infidel, or rationalistic party, with whom it alarms the evangelicals to be found in unison.

While much tenderness is due to good men thus placed in an infelicitous position, we cannot allow ourselves to shrink from a full expression of our sentiments on this important subject. And we must say that we do not see anything convincing in the distinction laid down by the author of the Letter between the Christian and the citizen. The Christian does not cease to be the citizen, and it is quite possible that something which he demands as a Christian may grow out of his rights as a citizen. Indeed, it seems to us that a man's rights as a citizen must be taken to comprehend all that he can with propriety ask from the government; and, consequently, that ‘liberty for the gospel,’ or for evangelical worship and proselytism, if it be not a part of a man's rights as a citizen, cannot rationally be asked of a government at all. If it be more than his right, why should he ask it? or, if asked, why should it be granted?

To say to any government, grant me liberty for evangelical action because I wish to propagate evangelism, is clearly to urge a reason of the smallest possible weight; a reason, it may be added, of no weight at all, except where the government itself is evangelical. This is the case, at least nominally, in the Protestant countries of Europe, and it is this which gives some measure of force to the pleadings for religious freedom now in progress in Germany; but this is a mere accident, the reverse of which is easily conceivable. Such a plea in Turkey or in China would be either powerless or worse; if the request were granted at all, it would be either under a pressure of external influences, or as the fruit

of an admission that it was a matter in which government ought not to interfere.

Besides, it is not the evangelical Christian only that might besiege a government with demands for liberty. Immediately after him comes the rationalist, the Friend of Light, the German Catholic, and a dozen other parties, each making a similar request, and upon a similar ground; and each, so far as the argument is concerned, as well entitled to be heard as the rest. What is the Government, thus importuned, to do? It is afraid to oblige all; and it must either refuse all, or make itself a judge of what is good for the community, and fit to be set at liberty. Again, this may be very convenient to Evangelical Christians where the government is Evangelical; but what where it is not so? To concede to the government a right to judge in any case, is to concede it in all; and the rule which in one instance might lead to the freedom of the Gospel, would lead, in others, with equal force and certainty, to its prohibition.

To the fears which are entertained by many good men in Germany that religious liberty would open the floodgates of error and irreligion, we should think some relief might be brought by a consideration of the fact, that matters in this respect could hardly be worse than they have notoriously been under the régime of protection. But we ask further, where is the faith of these worthy men in the power and destiny of truth? To this it is replied, that, although truth would ultimately triumph, much mischief might be wrought in the interval, for which they dare not make themselves responsible. But let us be permitted to rejoin, by inquiring who has requested them to assume a responsibility for any issues of this kind? Are not these things in the hand of the Supreme Ruler? And ought not these friends *par eminence* of truth and human welfare to be content to leave them there? Have they not in reality already assumed a responsibility alike unwarranted and grave, in undertaking to hold in abeyance intellectual powers which God has made for action, and to place upon moral energies fetters of a kind which he never meant they should wear?

Count Albert de Pourtales enters into an historical statement, to prove that the question of religious liberty holds a different position in Germany from that which it does in France, Switzerland, and England. We have had to fight for liberty, they to contrive a peace, and a peace which they deem so essential to their national existence that it must not be broken. That is to say, the agreement of the Reformed and Lutheran churches to occupy the ground between them is to operate everlastingly to the exclusion of all other parties. This is nothing but a combined, instead of a single, despotism. A tyranny is none the less hateful or unjust

because parties who were once at variance ultimately conspire to maintain it, and agree to call it peace.

While the warmest friends of religious liberty among the evangelical party in Germany thus shrink from maintaining it without restriction, the political powers of the continent repudiate it altogether. The admirable paper of Mr. Plitt, professor of theology and ecclesiastical law in the University of Heidelberg, which we have placed at the head of this article, in a most luminous manner treats this question, and proves to demonstration the conclusion at which he arrives—viz., ‘By law we have no religious liberty in Germany.’ And such as is the law, so, with scarcely an exception, are the governments. Making honourable mention of the kingdom of Wurtemberg, which, we believe, is an exception, and of the kingdom of Prussia, in which the king has shown himself favourable to a tolerant system; we may say, that the general, if not the universal resolution of the governing powers, is, that no mode of religious worship shall be permitted except that sanctioned by law.

This avowal stands out particularly in the case of the prime minister of Mecklenburg Schwerin, Count von Bülow, a man of whose courtesy and christian feeling the deputation speak in the highest terms.

‘Lutheranism,’ he said, ‘was the only recognised form of religion in the country. There were a few congregations of the Reformed or Calvinistic faith, and two congregations of Roman Catholics; but their existence formed no exception to the statement he had made, since they were allowed, not by law, but by the special permission of the Crown granted in each particular case. Besides these there were no other churches, and none would be permitted. The Baptist worship consequently was illegal, and as such was suppressed. The Baptists had no ministers in Mecklenburg *de jure*, nor by royal permission, and would be allowed to have none, nor to organize churches. The hardships they had endured could not be complained of, because they were only the penalty justly inflicted for the violation of the law, which forbade the holding of religious meetings and the administration of the sacraments, of both which misdemeanours they had been guilty. They might entertain their opinions, but they must not profess them. They might worship in their families, but other persons might not be present; nor might they make proselytes. The law would not molest a man for being a Baptist or a Methodist, or of any other religious way that he pleased, for the law gave universal liberty of conscience, so that all men were free to embrace what sentiments they chose, only they must keep them to themselves. A man might be baptized and the law would not punish him, but the man who baptized him would be punished. The government must protect the Lutheran Church, and guard its subjects against the intrusion of any other faith; hence it was its duty to suppress all missionary efforts on the part of other

religionists, and it would continue rigorously to prohibit their attempts to propagate their views.'—*Ibid.* p. 16.

Such we believe to be the determination of the Protestant governments of Germany in general; and, although we do not shut our eyes to certain symptoms of a favourable nature—such as the kindly tone of the discussion at the recent Kirchentag at Berlin—we are far from being able to conceive with an eminently well-informed contemporary, that 'the reign of religious intolerance has received its death-blow in Germany.'*

* 'North British Review,' for February, 1854, Art., 'German Protestantism.' Having mentioned this article, we shall avail ourselves of the permission we have received to make use of the following remarks on it, by a gentleman fully qualified to speak on the subject. We shall only say that we entirely concur in the eulogy contained in the first sentence.

'The paper shows such an intimate acquaintance with the subject, and mastery of it, that it cannot but have great influence, and its questionable points are therefore the more worthy of notice. I shall touch on three.

'The first is involved in the sentence where the writer says, speaking of Religious Liberty,—“Its argumentative triumph is complete.” If he were writing of the logic of his subject, I should not, of course, deny the accuracy of his statement, or call it in question. In that sense all impartial persons would acknowledge the victory to be on the side of the friends of freedom. But he is giving its history, and it certainly seems premature to say historically that, in the field of argument, the victory has been achieved, when as yet on that field there has been no conflict. The discussion in the Kirchentag was not argumentative, and I have heard of no work issuing from the press on the one side or the other. The breaking of this ground has been what I have long wished for, and my hope is that the pamphlet of Count de Pourtales will lead on to something further. I heartily wish it may kindle the controversy. Besides which, does not this very pamphlet show that the essential principle of intolerance is still argumentatively entrenched in the minds of some of the most enlightened statesmen of the land? And I know that the position which he takes would be very extensively defended—the position that religious freedom for all is not a Christian principle, but must be maintained, if it be maintained at all, by political arguments, and not by the teachings of Christianity. This battle I fear is yet to be fought.

'The next questionable point lies in the opinion which he expresses very strongly, that “The reign of religious intolerance has received its death-blow in Germany. Of this,” he says, “there can be no question.” This opinion he justifies by two reasons, “the amended spirit of legislation,” and the “tone of the Berlin Kirchentag.” Let the latter stand for all it is worth. I would not wish to diminish its force. It took some of the leaders themselves by surprise, who were not prepared for such speeches as were made by Sack and Kapff; and it is a tone of feeling which must grow in the hearts of good men. As it increases it will neutralize intolerant laws, which, though they should not be repealed, will fall into desuetude before it. At the same time, that assembly was composed of only some 1200 or 1500 of the clergy of Germany, scarcely a tenth, I suppose, of the whole number, and these the best men amongst them. It will, I fear, take a long while for their leaven to leaven the whole lump. His former reason, the improved legislation of Germany, he finds in the Prussian law of 1847, putting toleration, as he says, “upon a legal basis;” and in the fact that a similar provision “forms a part of all the new constitutions.” No

It may to us, in this land of liberty, seem strange that the continental governments should cling with such inveterate tenacity to their despotic authority in matters of religion; but two causes may be assigned for it, the one political, the other ecclesiastical. The former of these is forcibly exhibited by Mr. Plitt, in the following extract from his paper already referred to:—

‘Government will say, We know by experience that believing Christians are good citizens and faithful subjects; that infidels are very often disobedient citizens and faithless subjects. We have seen that chiefly the latter were implicated in the last revolution. It is a fact, that during this time and in the years immediately before the revolution, religious liberty was demanded generally, not for conscience’ sake, but to advance a political revolution. It is a fact that the propagandists of the revolution, when they could not act openly, endeavoured to establish one “free congregation” after another, such congregations as avowed a decided infidelity. It is a fact that it was the plan of this propaganda to undermine the Christian faith of our people, because they wished to use for their purposes the people who no longer believed in Christ. “Only then can things become better,” said one of the leaders of this propaganda, “when man is no longer attached to heaven by a single thread.” When the revolution had broken out, Ronge and Dowiat declared openly, that only blockheads believed them to be acting for religious purposes. They had used religion only as a pretence. They never had religious, but only political purposes. By these and similar reasons, the governments were induced to abolish, after the revolution, the religious liberty which was given during the revolution. It seemed that religious liberty had furthered infidelity, and infidelity the revolution.’—‘Evangelical Christendom’ p. 47.

It is thus that religious and political freedom are, to a certain extent, linked together, and that the denial of the one impedes

doubt something was gained, perhaps more than at present appears, when Prussia took the step referred to; but what with remaining restrictions, police regulations, and officials almost everywhere thwarting the law, it has not worked out much practical liberty even in Prussia, while it has no effect at all over all the rest of Germany. And then as to “the new constitutions,” they now exist only on paper, and will need another revolution to vivify them again. The ecclesiastical legislation of Germany is an iron despotism with no flexibility. It is a yoke which must be broken, but will never bend.

‘The last point upon which I animadvert is the oversight, as I think it, involved in his approval of what he calls, “the not unnatural determination to deny in future all church offices and privileges to the separatists, who should be left to their own resources.” He forgets that “church privileges” take a wide sweep in Germany, comprehending marriage, burial, civil status, and touching a man in almost all the relations of domestic, social, and public life. By all means let separatists be left to their own resources, but do not at the same time deny them the use of the resources to which they are left. To cut them off from “church privileges,” in the existing state of things, is to put them out of civilized society altogether.’

the granting of the other. Even if this obstruction were removed, however, that which we have called the ecclesiastical hindrance would still operate. It is a fact well known, that, in many instances, the hostile proceedings have neither been taken spontaneously by the police,* nor required by the superior powers, but that they have been instigated, sometimes in a public and disgraceful manner, by the local clergy, who have an interest at stake in repressing every effort by which a reduction might be effected in their flocks and their emoluments. Thus are these intolerant and cruel measures to be placed among the bitter fruits of that fundamental folly and crime, the legislative endowment of Christianity, and the formation of national churches.

Both the ecclesiastical and political powers of Europe, however, may be assured that a system of despotism over the consciences of men cannot last for ever—it may not last long. The severe pressure of the governments on freedom of religious action is, at the present moment, very painfully felt, and it doubtless constitutes one of those sins against human nature which, in the course of national progress, is sure to find a just retribution. The question is worth the grave consideration of the German governments, whether it were not wiser and better, by the relinquishment of their religious control, to win the love,

* We hope we may be doing no more than justice to this class of functionaries in recording the following instance of good sense and good feeling among them. To their narration of the proceedings in Saxe Meiningen, the deputation annex the following note:—

“Since our return, Dr. Steane has received a letter from Mr. Wegener, dated Ludwigslust, October 19, in which he says, that on the 14th an officer of justice came to him from the minister, to say that an execution would be put into his house for the costs of the last proceedings against him, amounting to something more than seventeen dollars, and that he must proceed to take an inventory of his effects. “But where,” said he, “are they? Your things are already gone; your cow is sold; what shall I take now?” I replied that he must take my wife and children; for if I was deprived of everything else, I should have nothing with which to support them. The man looked perplexed, but said he must execute his commission, painful as it might be to him. “He knew,” he remarked, “and the authorities knew that I was a good and peaceful citizen, and it would be well,” he continued, “if all the inhabitants of the place led such a life as I did. They (the officers) would lay no hand on me, unless they were forced to do so by the ministry; and every one’s faith was certainly a matter between God and his own conscience.” Finding that there were no articles of furniture of any value left, the officer was about to set down the house, when he was told there was still a pig and a goat, and that he must take them. These words, Mr. Wegener says, coming from his wife, quite overcame the man. “Your cow is gone,” he exclaimed, “and will you now part with your pig and your goat?” and the man wept bitterly, adding, “How is it possible!”—Protestant Persecutions, p. 14.

instead of, as now, inspiring the hatred of those whom they rule.

It is a singular circumstance that the religionists, who have caused so much annoyance to the German governments, are chiefly Baptists. They have, in truth, sprung from the christian zeal and activity of an individual of this body, the Rev. J. G. Oncken, of Hamburg, assisted by Christians of the same denomination in the United States. Of all Christian denominations in Germany, the Baptists are ecclesiastically the most offensive, not only as by their name—but, happily, by their name only—associating themselves with a most infelicitous and fearful portion of German history, but also as standing in a peculiar antagonism to the interests and influence of the national churches. Baptism, indeed, is laid at the foundation at once of the ecclesiastical and the political fabric. It is from the registered baptism of the child by the state clergyman, that the only evidence of his social existence is derived: apart from this, throughout the whole of his life, he has no rights, no privileges, no recognition. He cannot be apprenticed, he cannot be married, he cannot be buried, otherwise than as a dog is buried. A religious community, consequently, who are not only separatists, which is offensive enough, but also deniers of baptism to infants, is an outrage beyond all endurance, since it threatens to undermine from its very base the ecclesiastical system, and to dry up the sources at once of its influence and its wealth.

It is on behalf of this body that the Rev. G. W. Lehmann, the truly respectable and worthy pastor of the Baptist church in Berlin, has spoken in the pamphlet at the head of this article. And he has spoken well—mildly—convincingly—firmly. Taking occasion from the reference to Methodists and Baptists in the proposition brought before the Kirchentag in 1853, in the discussion of which he was not permitted to take a part, he makes an appeal to the members of that body, which certainly ought not to be without effect. The tract has been translated and published in this country, where its circulation cannot but contribute to its influence in Germany. We should be glad to give copious extracts from it, but our necessary limits restrict us to a single one:

‘It is further to be considered’ (says Mr. Lehmann, speaking of the proceedings of the Berlin Kirchentag), ‘that however favourable and liberal the resolutions of the Kirchentag were in reference to the Homburg Conference, yet they seemed almost to have been improvised, and formed a decided contrast to the proceedings which took place at the beginning of the second day; that men of high and most important influential position, to whom power is entrusted, have expressed themselves about the sects in no very friendly manner; and that to some extent innovations have been hinted at in reference to the

application of secular means of compulsion; circumstances which by no means allow us to think of a change in the system which prevails in the government of church and state—(with us, indeed, most intimately connected and interwoven)—not to say that the Kirchentag is only a free association, without any legislative or administrative power. We must therefore fear that we shall hear further of persecutions, processes, incarcerations, fines, distrains, and banishments; elements in which our recent religious history is so abundant, and more so than most evangelical Christians appear to imagine. But who troubles himself to ask after the fate of the despised and hated sectaries, who, for the most part, move in the lowest walks of social life? The persecuted and imprisoned Baptists are not so fortunate as to create a sensation, like the Madaïas and the Cunninghames, or to put princes and statesmen in commotion. They receive in their cells their bread and water, looking up in silence and obscurity to Him who looks from heaven upon earth to hear the sighing of the prisoners, although no tear of sympathy be accorded to them by the high and noble of the earth. Oh! when the history of the Baptists in Germany during the nearly twenty years of their existence shall be unfolded; when the sighs and the tears, the threatenings and the forcible entries of their dwellings, the puffing and blustering of *gendarmes* and police officers—of bailiffs, sheriffs, magistrates, and judges; when the thousandfold distresses which they inflicted, who, with oaths and curses, broke up meetings where the most ardent love to God was poured out; when the witnesses of Jesus and the bearers of his holy word transported as vagabonds; when the poorest deprived of the veriest necessities; when the bound and imprisoned men, women, and children; when all these are at length presented in a vivid and intelligible picture to the Christian public, then will tender and feeling hearts assuredly be touched by it, and mankind will here too admire what the love of Christ can do, and to what joyful sacrifices it can constrain. Our age does not in any respect equal that of our fathers, not even in regard to what is suffered for the name of Jesus; but, if the people of God in all times are called upon to make up in their flesh what is yet wanting of the afflictions of Christ, then certainly it is the German Baptists to whose lot this has especially fallen in our time.'—Lehmann's Letters, pp. 21, 22.

We know that the title which these worthy men have to the sympathy of the religious world is, not that they are Baptists, but that they are Christians; but we plead that they should not be cut off from the sympathy that is due to them as Christians, because they are Baptists. Indeed, we venture to assure them that it will not be so. With a noble catholicity, the Christian gentlemen who assembled at Homburg entered into their sufferings; and the executive committee have acted in the spirit of the conference. The sincere followers of Christ, of every name, will follow their example, and at once uphold by their prayers, and encourage by every demonstration of Christian love, those simple-minded confessors, upon whom it falls in so large a

measure to fill up what is behind of the sufferings of their Lord.

We trust it may not be long—for the Executive Committee will never stop here—before something is done for their effectual relief; and we should be happy to learn that the act of grace, which has for some time been promised by the king of Prussia, has been officially completed. It would be but taking a position to which he is well entitled, and performing an act from which the happiest consequences would follow throughout the whole of Germany, if he would set the example, in this instance, of a wise and enlightened policy. But, however this may be, we hold out most cordially to our persecuted—we have no scruple in using the word—to our persecuted brethren, the hand of fellowship. We say to them, be of good cheer, for we doubt not that God is with you. Let your Christian conduct put to silence the ignorance of foolish men; and may God, who requires you to act so distinguished a part in his cause, ‘count you worthy of this calling, and fulfil in you all the good pleasure of his goodness, and the work of faith with power!’

ART. VI.—*The Prayer-book of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri.*

London: Burns and Lambert. 1853.

THE last new phase of Popery, so far at least as regards England, made its appearance, some time since, in the metropolis of this kingdom. It was a chapel devoted to the performance of Romish worship, in which none associated but clergymen who had seceded from the Established Church. The avowed object of this measure was, of course, the conversion, or, as we should say, perversion of other Protestants to the religion of Rome. The chapel, which was fitted up with extreme magnificence and splendour, was dedicated to an Italian saint—St. Philip Neri. Its clergy are, from the nature of the case, men of education, and in some cases of high birth; and are admitted to be the most active and zealous proselytizers in the whole world.

In this little *ruse de guerre*, Rome has shown her usual tact. The defection of so many of the clergy of the Church of England, and their accession to the Church of Rome, was undoubtedly a triumph to the latter. Here then was a means of rendering the fact conspicuous to the eyes of men—of keeping up the recollection of the disgrace in the public mind. And it was, not without reason, judged by the rulers of the Papacy, that the sight of a

body of officiating priests, entirely composed of clergy of the establishment, who had sought admission into the bosom of the Holy Catholic Church, would probably influence many of their flock to take the same step.

The volume, whose title stands at the head of this article, is a manual of devotion composed for the use of the congregation meeting for worship in the chapel we have just described; and on many accounts we are glad that it has fallen under our notice. It is always desirable to have within our reach authoritative evidence of the doctrines and practices of false religions; especially when we are placed in actual conflict with the bodies professing them. As regards Romanism this is particularly the case, as every one who has ever engaged in controversy with a popish priest will readily admit. We rejoice then at the publication of the 'Prayer-book of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri,' and shall at once proceed to inform the reader what really are the faith and worship of our leading Roman Catholic countrymen, in the middle of the nineteenth century, and in the metropolis of Great Britain.

One of the most noticeable features in this new Prayer-book—that which most forcibly strikes the Protestant reader—is, undoubtedly, *the excessive prominence, and blasphemous character of the worship of Mary*, as set forth in its pages.

It is well known that the Word of God not only does not afford the slightest sanction to the worship of the mother of our Lord, but as though to guard against that frightful idolatry which afterwards sprang up in the church, positively condemns any approach to it.

On only *three* occasions do we find our Lord addressing the mother of his humanity in the Gospels. The first was during his childhood, when Mary having found Him in the Temple remonstrated with Him, 'Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? Thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing.' The answer of Jesus was, 'Wist ye not that I must be about my FATHER'S business?' Here evidently our Lord does not recognise, but rather repudiate his mother's authority in the work of God. The next occasion on which Christ addressed his mother was at the marriage in Cana. His language there was, '*Woman*, what have I to do with thee? mine hour is not yet come.' Who does not see here that the language was evidently chosen designedly to check any tendency to *undue* estimation of this excellent and highly-favoured female in after time? The last instance of direct address to Mary took place when our Redeemer was dying on the cross. 'When Jesus therefore saw his mother and the disciple standing by whom he loved, he said unto his mother, *Woman*, behold thy son; then said he to the disciple, Behold

thy mother.' Even here, be it observed, though in the agonies of death, he does not call her 'my mother,' lest it should afford some ground, though ever so slight, for abusing the expression, and styling Mary, as was afterwards done, the 'Mother of God!'

It is a remarkable fact, too, that she is scarcely even so much as named in any subsequent book of the Bible. John, to whose care Mary was commended, never once alludes to her either in his Epistles, or in the Revelation. Paul, who dwells so fully upon the great work of Christ's mediation, makes not the slightest reference to her. James, Peter, and Jude, pass her by in complete silence. She is never mentioned in connexion with the many interviews and conversations held by our Lord with his disciples previous to his resurrection, and only once subsequently. Even her death is unrecorded. Surely all this shows a settled purpose in the mind of the Spirit, to afford no handle for the undue veneration of Mary, on the ground of the relation which she bore to the humanity of our blessed Lord.

Bearing these facts in mind we open the 'Prayer-book of the Oratory,' and what do we behold?—Adoration the most extraordinary and blasphemous that can be conceived paid to Mary.

The very commencement of the devotions of the Oratory introduces this new goddess to our notice. Instead of what is called, in the Church of England, 'The Apostles' Creed,' though improperly so, we have the following *Act of Faith*:—

'I firmly believe—because God, who is infallible truth, hath so revealed it to the Holy Catholic Church, and through the Church to us—I firmly believe that there is one only God in three Divine Persons, equal and distinct, whose names are Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: that the Son became man, and through the operation of the Holy Spirit took flesh, and a human soul in the womb of the *most pure* Virgin Mary, died for us upon the cross, rose again, ascended into Heaven, and will come thence, at the end of the world, to judge all the living and dead, to give Paradise to the good, and Hell to the wicked for ever: and, furthermore, upon the same motive I believe everything that the Holy Church believes and teaches.'

Here it will be observed, what cannot be said of the Romish creed, as given in the missal or breviary of that church, Mary is styled *most pure*, and, accordingly, she is worshipped, in the subsequent pages, in a higher strain than in any of the service books of Rome that we are acquainted with. Take first of all the prayers addressed to the Majesty of Heaven, which are, nevertheless, full of the praises of Mary. The first prayer in the book is as follows:—

'In company with the whole court of Heaven, I adore Thee, O Eternal Father, as my Lord and my God, and I offer thee infinite thanks for all the graces and favours Thou hast bestowed upon *the*

most Holy Virgin, Thy beloved daughter, and especially for that power with which Thou didst enrich her, in her assumption into Heaven.

‘In company with the whole court of Heaven, I adore Thee, O Eternal Son, as my God, my Lord, and my Redeemer, and I offer Thee infinite thanks, for all the graces and favours Thou hast bestowed upon *the most Holy Virgin, Thy beloved Mother, and especially for that surpassing wisdom, with which Thou didst adorn her, in her assumption into Heaven.*

‘I adore Thee, O Holy Spirit, as my God and Lord, and in company with the whole court of Heaven, I offer Thee infinite thanks for all the graces and favours Thou hast bestowed upon *the Blessed Virgin, Thy MOST LOVING SPOUSE, and especially for that perfect and divine charity with which Thou didst inflame her most pure and holy heart, in her assumption into Heaven.* I humbly implore Thee, *in thy immaculate spouse,* to grant me pardon for all the grievous sins I have committed, from the first moment I was able to sin till the present hour; I am exceedingly sorry for all these my sins, and I firmly purpose to die rather than again offend Thy Divine Majesty. *By the exceeding great merits, and powerful protection of thy loving Spouse,* I beseech Thee to grant me the precious gifts of Thy grace and divine love, together with those lights, and special aids, through which Thy eternal Providence has predetermined to save me and bring me to Thyself.’

Here we see the Oratorian even in addressing God, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, does so for the purpose of extolling ‘the power,’ ‘the wisdom,’ ‘the perfect and divine charity’ of the Virgin; and not satisfied with the constant repetition of the ridiculous fable of Mary’s assumption to Heaven, exalts her to a level with Deity, by styling her the ‘Immaculate Spouse’ of the Holy Ghost!

The second prayer in the book is addressed to Mary herself. It is as follows:—

‘O Most Holy Virgin, Queen of Heaven, and Mistress of the Universe, I acknowledge and worship thee as the daughter of the Eternal Father, as the mother of the Eternal Son, and as the loving Spouse of the Holy Spirit. Prostrate at the feet of thy august Majesty, I beseech thee, by that divine charity with which thou wast filled to overflowing at thy assumption into Heaven, mercifully to take me under thy most powerful and secure protection, and to receive me into that fortunate company of thy happy servants whom thou lovest and cherishest in thy virginal bosom. Condescend, O my Mother, and most gentle Lady, to accept of this miserable heart of mine,’ &c.

Then follows another prayer in which ‘eternal salvation’ is besought ‘through the intercession of the mother of our Lord;’ after which occurs the following address to Mary:—

‘O Most Holy Virgin, Mother of the Word incarnate, *keeper of the treasures of grace,* and refuge of us miserable sinners; we have recourse to thy motherly love with lively faith, and *beg of thee the grace ever*

to do God's will and Thine. We give up our hearts into thy most holy hands, and *implore of Thee the salvation of our souls and bodies*, and in the sure hope, that thou, who art our most loving mother wilt hear us, we say with lively faith:—"Three hail Marys."

Nothing can be clearer than the fact that *divine worship* is here paid to Mary. But should any doubt remain that such is the case, it will be at once dispelled by perusing the following devotional exercises, which are headed

‘DIVINE PRAISES.’

V.—Blessed be God.

R.—Blessed be His holy name.

V.—Blessed be Jesus Christ, true God and true man.

R.—Blessed be the name of Jesus.

V.—Blessed be Jesus in the most holy Sacrament of the altar.

R.—Blessed be the great Mother of God, the Most Holy Mary.

V.—Blessed be the name of Mary, Virgin and Mother.

R.—Blessed be God in His Angels, and in His Saints.’

Here, it will be observed, Mary is praised in conjunction with the Father and the Son, in a series of praises expressly called *divine*. The angels and saints are mentioned, it is true, at the close, but they are not praised, though God is praised in them. Mary, on the contrary, is praised in herself, precisely as God himself is!

The authors of the celebrated ‘Catechism of the Council of Trent,’ in expounding the practice of the Church of Rome, some two or three centuries ago, make the following statement. ‘We make use,’ say these fathers, ‘of two forms of prayer, widely different from each other; for, whereas in speaking to God, we say, “Have mercy on us,” “hear us;” in addressing ourselves to a saint, we say no more than “Pray for us.”* We shall not stay to inquire how far this is a correct account of the practice of Romanists at the time it was written, but this much is certain, that our modern Oratorians, under the guidance of Dr. Newman, have gone far beyond such moderate idolatry as this. In the prayers just quoted, we find Mary not only ‘besought’ ‘mercifully to take’ the suppliants ‘under her most powerful and secure protection,’ but even asked ‘to grant’ them ‘the grace even to do God’s will *and hers*;’ and to crown the whole she is finally ‘implored’ to grant them ‘the salvation of their souls and bodies.’

Here then we take our stand, and deliberately charge the Fathers of the Oratory with the practice and propagation of a system of creature-worship and idolatry equal in degree, and more deadly and destructive in its effects, than that of ancient

* Catechism. Rom., p. iv. De Cult. Sanct.

Greece and Rome. The deities of Paganism were never worshipped with the reality and the fervour which breathes in the prayers addressed by the Oratorians to the so-called 'Mother of God.' Jupiter and Minerva, Apollo and Ceres, never excited such feelings in the breasts of their heathen worshippers as we find expressed in the passionate entreaties of which Mary is the object in the prayer-book of the Oratory. Paganism, at the best, was but a cold and lifeless system. Founded on the mere fancies of the imagination, it never affected the heart, or influenced the life. But the Mariolatry of Romanism, as here set forth, consists in the transfer of the praises, the affections, the obedience, which rightfully belong to God and to Christ alone, to the person of a once imperfect and sinful mortal like ourselves. In a word, the worship of the Oratory takes with one hand the 'many crowns' from off the brow of Him who is the 'King of kings and Lord of lords;' and, with the other, places them on the reluctant head of a mere female, created by his breath, and redeemed by his blood!

Another saint who figures forth in the worship of the Oratory, as second only to Mary, is her husband Joseph—the reputed* father of our blessed Lord. As there was no actual relationship between this devout man and Christ, it is really marvellous how the ingenuity of the Romanist has contrived to invest him with divine honours. The following may be taken as a fair sample of the adoration of which 'St. Joseph' is the object:—

'O glorious St. Joseph, *most pure spouse of the Most Holy Mary*, even as the trouble and anguish of thy heart were great, in the perplexity of abandoning thy most chaste and stainless spouse, so, too, inexplicable was thy delight, when the angel revealed to thee the sovereign mystery of the incarnation.

'O glorious St. Joseph, most blessed patriarch, who wast selected for the office of reputed father of the Word made man; the grief which thou didst feel at seeing the child Jesus born in such great poverty, was suddenly changed for thee into heavenly exaltation at seeing the glories of that most resplendent night.'

[Here follows an invocation.]

'O glorious St. Joseph, who didst fulfil most obediently all God's commands, the most precious blood which the child-Redeemer shed in the circumcision struck death into thy heart, but the name of Jesus revived it, and filled it full of joy.

'O most glorious St. Joseph, most faithful saint, who wast a partaker in the mysteries of our redemption, if Simeon's prophecy of that which Jesus and Mary were to suffer caused thee a mortal pang, it filled thee also with a blessed joy, at the salvation and glorious resurrection

* *Reckoned as his father* in the public register of his birth.

of innumerable souls, which he, at the same time, foretold would thence proceed.'

[Here follows another invocation.]

'O glorious St. Joseph, most watchful friend and familiar attendant of the incarnate Son of God, how much didst thou suffer in supporting and serving the Son of the Most High, particularly in the flight which thou hadst to make into Egypt, but how much again didst thou rejoice at having always with thee that same God, and at seeing the idols of Egypt fall to the ground.'

[Another invocation.]

'O glorious St. Joseph, angel of the earth, who didst marvel at beholding the King of Heaven subject to thy commands, if thy consolation at bringing Him back from Egypt was disturbed by the fear of Archelaus, yet, when assured by the angel, thou didst dwell in joy with Jesus and Mary at Nazareth.'

[An invocation.]

It would be easy to quote abundance of other specimens of Oratorian saint-worship, but it is needless. We proceed, therefore, to mention another revolting feature in the religion of Dr. Newman and his fellow-converts, which is, the *grossly material character of their worship*, even when offered to Christ himself.

We did not need to learn from the prayer-book of the Oratory that the worship in which Romanists delight is material and sensuous. Every Protestant who has entered a Romish chapel must have been struck with the contrast between the religion of Rome and the religion of Christ in this respect. It needs, alas! no great spiritual discernment to discover that the worshippers who attend at mass do not '*worship Him who is a Spirit, in spirit and in truth.*' Still we were not prepared, we confess, for the extraordinary enthusiasm which these modern Romanists manifest towards the body of Christ, which seems to be fixed upon as the principal object of love and veneration, next to the so-called 'Mistress of the Universe.' More especially are the heart and blood of Jesus singled out for praise and veneration, affection and worship. We have not only a 'Chaplet of the sacred Heart,' but also a 'Prayer to the Heart.' Then we find a 'Prayer to the Blood,' and 'Offerings to Christ of his own blood from each of His five wounds, in as many distinct ecstasies.'

Such is the empty, puerile, and, to us, disgusting kind of worship offered up in the Oratory of St. Philip Neri by this body of *neophytes* and their followers. It has often been discussed by writers against popery, whether the peculiar doctrines and practices of that religion are the result of certain inherent tendencies in man's corrupt nature; or, whether they have been invented by the rulers of that apostate church with a view to their own

aggrandizement and power. As is often the case, we think the truth lies between the two. The superstitions and errors of Rome have to a very considerable extent *originated* in the corrupt desires of the natural man; but they have to, perhaps, an equal extent, been guided and moulded and fostered by a crafty and ambitious priesthood, for the attainment of their own selfish designs. And this is the true explanation, we conceive, of that remarkable feature in Romanism which we have just considered—the *grossly material* and *sensuous* character of the worship in which Romanists engage. Composed, as the vast body of them confessedly are, of unrenewed persons, the only kind of worship of which they have any idea is one which engages the senses. The tendency of the people, therefore, has always been to prefer what is *material* and *sensuous* to what is addressed to the intellect and to the heart. On the other hand, the priests and bishops have found their interest in establishing a form of religious worship which engages the attention and occupies the mind of the votary without affecting the heart. In this respect, popery has well been styled ‘Satan’s masterpiece,’ that whilst it calls itself Christianity, and contains in some form or other almost all the leading doctrines and practices of Revelation, it has with consummate artifice and skill contrived by its superstitions and its idolatries, so to neutralize their influence, or pervert their effects, that it no more now deserves the name of the religion of Christ than Mohammedanism, or Buddhism itself does.

ART. VII.—*Observations on the Abuse and Reform of the Monitorial System of Harrow School, with Letters and Remarks.* By the Earl of Galloway. London: Thomas Hatchard.

2. *A Letter to the Viscount Palmerston, M.P., &c. &c. &c., on the Monitorial System of Harrow School.* By Charles John Vaughan, D.D., Head Master. Second Edition. London: John Murray.
3. *The Daily News*, March 9, 22, 24, April 3, 4, and 15.
4. *The Observer*, April 3.
5. *The Weekly Dispatch*, April 9.
6. *The Times*, April 13 and 17.
7. *The Standard*, April 16.

PUBLIC attention has long been earnestly devoted to the vexed questions which relate to the education of the rising masses of our fellow-countrymen. It has been, however, partially directed through recent circumstances to the methods employed in the

education of the higher classes. It is obvious, that the numerical difference between the two classes under instruction by no means indicates the proportionate importance of the two subjects; namely, the systems under which the high and the low, respectively, shall be educated in this country. The early discipline of the aristocracy is a matter of far greater moment to the people at large than would be indicated statistically by the ratio apparent on the face of a census. Their virtues stand out like a city set upon a hill, but their vices have unhappily a far more extensive influence; for of these the humbler classes are at once the imitators, the instruments, and the victims. All that is vicious in their modes of thought and conduct, in their social habits and recreations, and even in their conventional discourse, percolates through the cleaner stratum of the middle class, and leaves there a comparatively innocuous tincture; but it drains through to the lower levels of society with its full virulence, and impregnates with a poison, the more diffusible from its very refinement, those coarser dregs which are represented by the most numerous, the most useful, and yet the most dangerous section of the community.

It is, doubtless, a general conviction of such truths as these that has lately drawn aside the attention of the public from the most momentous political events, and engaged it with no little interest on the management of those great aristocratic institutions—our public schools. This has been directly occasioned by some recent occurrences at Harrow and Rugby, which have been ventilated chiefly through the persistent animadversions of the 'Daily News.' In some remarks which we lately took occasion to make on the proposed legislation with reference to conventual establishments, we pointed out the greater importance of public vigilance and supervision in proportion to the secrecy of those establishments, and the consequent difficulty of obtaining the very evidence on which such legislation should be based, and by which it would be clearly justified. The same principle equally applies to our public schools. The high reputation of their directors and masters, the exclusive privileges they possess, both by charter and by usage, their prestige as the nursery of statesmen and ecclesiastical dignitaries, and the high station of those who adopt them for the training of their sons, tend conjointly to lull suspicion as to their administration, and to surround them with a barrier impervious to popular scrutiny. But these very conditions, coupled again with the antiquity of their methods of management and discipline, make it only the more necessary that the press should seize upon the evidence of their maladministration which casually escapes, and vigorously turn it to the account of purification and reform. Two such instances have lately excited

very general attention, and they afford an opportunity of which we deem it our duty to avail ourselves of calling the attention of our readers to some capital defects and some flagrant wrongs connected with the regulations of our public schools. In doing so, we shall strive to keep within due bounds the feelings of indignation excited in our minds by the facts we are about to detail, and to indulge in no unnecessary censure upon those gentlemen, on many grounds highly entitled to our respect, on whose conduct we must take the liberty freely to animadvert. We shall commence with a simple narrative of facts as they are supplied to us by the public organs named at the head of this article.

The first case develops the operation of the fagging system, and the scene is, we might almost say accidentally, laid at Rugby. The second will show the effects of the monitorial system, which, again, only *happens* to have transpired at Harrow. Both may be fairly coupled together, and we shall have no difficulty in showing that they are the necessary results of one and the same system; and that in this respect the two schools may be fairly regarded as samples of the rest. We will only add, that so far as our careful investigation has extended, none of the facts published by the newspapers have been contradicted or impugned by those who have been forced by the responsibility of their position to undertake the task of apology.

A short time ago, two senior Rugby boys, sixteen or seventeen years of age, were exercising their lawful authority over a younger school-fellow, apparently about ten or eleven years of age, probably one of their fags, by insisting on his jumping over a wide stream of water. The little boy, conscious that it was impossible for him to clear the stream, did not dare to attempt it, and begged for mercy. His oppressors immediately proceeded to inflict upon him a cruel chastisement for this insolent rebellion; having first stripped him of his jacket, which they threw into the stream, and kicked out the crown of his hat. They further compelled him to wade through the stream, and then one of the ruffians beat him cruelly, while the other dragged him about by his hair. During these proceedings, a farmer's son, whose name deserves to be honourably mentioned, John Cranfield, was attracted to the spot by the cries of the suffering boy; and having learned the state of the case, rescued the poor little fellow from their barbarity, and inflicted on the dastardly oppressors such a severe punishment as they are not likely to forget. The summary justice of the village Hampden soon became the town talk of Rugby, and a report of the circumstances was forwarded to London by a correspondent of the 'Daily News,' and published in that paper. Shortly after this, the said correspondent was

stopped in the street by two of the elder boys, taxed with this offence against their local supremacy, pinned in a corner, and attacked with so much violence, that he was compelled, in self-defence, to knock down one of the ruffians, and to practise a little wholesome phlebotomy on the nose of the other. He then brought them before the local magistrates for the assault, and the ingenious *alumni* having been remanded by the civil authorities to the tender mercies of the Head Master, were soundly birched *more majorum*.

Leaving Rugby for the present, we proceed to Harrow. A youth, of the name of Stewart, son of the Earl of Galloway, whose general good conduct had recently been reported to his noble parents by the Head Master, was playing at foot-ball on the Harrow play-ground. An opponent in the game, of the name of Holmes, was about to kick the ball, when young Stewart cried out to him not to do so, as he was 'behind;' that is, in a position in which by the laws of the game it was unfair for him to interfere with the play. Holmes at once admitted the objection, and drew back. Immediately after, another of Stewart's antagonists, of the name of Platt, came up to Stewart, and denied that Holmes was behind, adding, 'You are always behind;' thus charging Stewart with falsehood, and habitually unfair play. The boy replied, that either he (Platt) was ignorant of the laws of the game, or that he was attempting to lay an unjust charge upon him. Now Platt was one of the monitors of Harrow School, the son, by the way, of Mr. Baron Platt, one of the Judges of the Court of Exchequer. On the following morning, Platt summoned Stewart to his room, and told him he had done so for the purpose of inflicting corporal punishment upon him for his insolence on the play-ground. Stewart naturally defended his conduct, the justice of his case having been at once admitted by his opponent, Holmes, and declined to take the punishment. Platt reminded him that the inevitable consequence of his refusal would be his expulsion from the school. Stewart still refused, and said he would appeal to the Head Master, Dr. Vaughan. Before he could carry out his intention, Platt secured an interview with the Doctor. According to Platt's statement, which Dr. Vaughan does not dispute, the Doctor sanctioned Platt's administration of the punishment, and absolutely refused to hear Stewart's defence. At Platt's particular and very safe request, however, Dr. Vaughan received a call from Stewart, whom he recommended to receive his punishment; adding, that it was not cowardly to submit to any infliction under *constituted authority*! Stewart immediately resolved to go to Platt's room, to apologise to him for his retort, and to submit to his punishment. But here he was anticipated by Platt, who summoned him again to the monitor's

library, where all the monitors were assembled, before he could carry out his own intentions. The scene which followed must be described in Mr. Stewart's own *uncontradicted* words. Indeed, it is due to the ingenuousness of the young sufferer, to give the account in the terms of his own letter to the Earl. He says:—

‘When I saw Dr. Vaughan he was *especially kind*,’ (the reader will recollect that this was written after Stewart had suffered under the cowardly brutality of Platt, which Dr. Vaughan had sanctioned,) ‘and told me that he was exceedingly sorry that I should have got into a mess with any of the monitors, and that as far as he heard, I was to blame in what I had said, and so he should advise me to take the whipping, as there was no cowardice in taking anything from a legal power. And so I went away with the determination of telling Platt that I would submit, and begging his pardon. He, however, anticipated me, and sent for me to the monitor's library directly after dinner, where he told me what he had said before in the morning, and asked me if I had altered my determination? I told him that I had, and that I would submit. He then gave me thirty-one cuts, as hard as ever he could, across the shoulder-blades, with a cane more than an inch in circumference, for which he paid more than 1s. 6d., and with such force that he had to stop almost every cut to bend back the cane, it was so curled back with the violence of the blow. I almost fainted during it; but I cannot help being glad that I managed to get out of the room without making the slightest movement to show him that I felt his brutality. I was immediately taken to Mr. Hewlett, who told me that he had never, in the whole course of his life, witnessed such an unmanly and brutal outrage. He immediately went to Dr. Vaughan; and the consequence is that Platt has been turned down, his monitorship taken away, and he himself, I hear, obliged to leave at the end of the quarter. Would you believe it? there was a place two inches broad from one arm to the other, as black as ink, as if I had been stained. Mr. Hewlett said that my arm was swollen four inches above its natural size. I shall not be able to go into school again till Sunday; and so I hope to write to-morrow to tell you any little thing I may have forgotten. I will give you my word of honour that I have told you everything impartially.’

The surgeon's report to the Earl of Galloway is as follows:—

‘Mr. Hewlett, the surgeon of Harrow School, having been called upon to examine the injuries, he was very properly desired by the head master to furnish Lord Galloway with a certificate of his son's condition; which he did in the following terms:—

‘MY LORD—I have been requested by Dr. Vaughan to forward to your lordship my report of the injury lately received by your lordship's son, Mr. Stewart. This gentleman came to my house, in company with a schoolfellow, on Wednesday, November 23, in a state of great suffering, and requested me to look at his back. On throwing off the shirt, I found the whole of the back across the shoulders, from the border of the left armpit to the top of the right shoulder, one entire mass of bruises, the colour varying from a bright red to a deep black. There

was one deeply blackened spot over the upper and broad part of the shoulder, covering a space of very nearly four inches square by measurement. The injury he had received was sufficiently severe to render it necessary for Mr. Stewart to go immediately to the sick room, where he was detained until the following Sunday, under medical treatment.'

The next scene in this disgusting drama opens with a letter from Mr. Platt to his father, which for the present we shall transcribe without comment:—

'On the afternoon of last Tuesday I was grossly insulted on the Football Field by a fellow in the upper fifth. It will shorten my story if I give you his name—Stewart. The language used was such as at any time or place would have called for severe notice, but the fact of its having been used on the Football Field, where the position of a monitor is held to be peculiarly sacred, and to the head of the game, made it a serious offence. The next morning I sent for Stewart to my room, and eventually told him that I must punish him there for an affront offered to the monitors in my person. He then said that he should refuse to take the punishment unless I forced him to do so. I warned him of the inevitable consequence of persisting in his refusal, that is to say, expulsion from the school; but he still refused, at the same time using insulting language. I then sent him away for the time, and went to Vaughan to ask his advice. He perfectly approved of all I had done, and even refused to see Stewart upon the subject until I asked him as a favour to me to do so, in order that I might give him every chance of clearing himself. *Upon Vaughan's advice, I punished Stewart before the monitors in the afternoon.* The punishment I inflicted upon him was not so severe as I have known to be inflicted for slighter offences. Stewart afterwards went to Hewlett, and what passed between them I do not know, but Hewlett then went to Vaughan and told him that the punishment had been too severe. As to what Hewlett said, Vaughan acknowledged to me afterwards that he did not at all understand the meaning of the terms which Hewlett used, that he knew that he had said that something must be applied, but he did not understand what, but thought it must be something only applied in rather severe cases. Upon the strength of these thoughts, he has put me down eight places, whereby I am no longer a monitor.

'Immediately after his doing this, I told him that I should write to you, and tell you that I could not stay here after this quarter in a position of degradation. He was most urgent in urging my remaining in the school, and expressed entire satisfaction with the manner in which I had exercised my monitorial authority during this quarter, at the same time leading me to believe that it was his intention to restore me to my place at the beginning of next quarter.

'Strangely enough, after this he has filled up my place among the monitors, none of whom leave this quarter, and I therefore do not see how he can restore me.

'It was at his request that I deferred writing to you until to-day, as he wished me to think over the matter before I did so. My opinion is unaltered; and the experience of three days of degradation has taught

me that, unless in compliance with your express wish, I could not undertake to go through months of it.

‘Although my personal authority may remain the same, my *moral influence* in the school must be impaired by it; and nothing but restoration to my own place again can remedy the evil.

‘Vaughan acknowledges to me that his reason for punishing me *so severely (!)* is, *not that he thinks that I deserve it, but that he fears what “people will say” if he does not.* This moral philosophy reminds me of Paley’s infidel doctrine of expediency.’

On the receipt of this letter, Mr. Baron Platt addressed a note to Dr. Vaughan, the most material part of which is as follows:—

“You say you have reason to know that my son’s conduct was disapproved of by his brother monitors. To this their own conduct on the occasion affords a decisive answer. If there had, in fact, been any excess in the chastisement, and they had so far neglected their duty as to omit to stop it, they would have been equally guilty of the excess, and equally responsible for its consequences. Why did they not interfere and stop the chastisement of which they are now said to have disapproved, at its proper limit? The answer is obvious. Because, until the contumacious boy, smarting with resentment and the mortification of wounded pride, had walked to the doctor, shown him his bruises, and obtained the doctor’s formidable prognostication of prolonged injury (which, however, does not seem likely to be realized), they did not consider that in the infliction the proper limit had been exceeded. The facts as they now stand satisfy me that my son’s conduct was unexceptionable. May I, therefore, implore you to reconsider the matter, for the sake of my son, for the sake of his family, for the sake of Harrow, and, with sincere respect I add, for the sake of yourself. We are all liable to err. Even the judges of the land, in their anxious and single-minded pursuit of justice, often err. They are always too happy in such cases to correct their errors. My son has been degraded, I think, unjustly.’

The publicity thus given to the occurrences at Harrow occasioned a letter from Lord Palmerston to the Head Master, which to our great regret, but doubtless for obvious reasons, has not been made public. It led, however, to Dr. Vaughan’s published reply, which we have now lying before us.

Having thus detailed the facts of these two cases, we proceed to make a few comments upon them.

With respect to the Rugby case, our first sentiment is that of surprise, that any parents in the slightest degree considerate for the character or the happiness of their children, should be found to place them in such a den of cruelty, there to incur alternately the guilt of tyrants, and the misery and degradation of slaves. The correspondent of the ‘Daily News,’ who first exposed this particular outrage, declares, that it was by no means an exceptional case; that similar brutalities are of common occurrence;

but that the poor victims dare not complain, and that none of the authorities of the school care enough about the matter to repress, or even to inquire into them.

The exposure of this particular case, however, before the magistrates at the Rugby Petty Sessions, appears to have produced on the Head Master that effect which a little publicity invariably produces on the principals of public schools. All hands are piped up in a panic, and the peccant parties are, by a sort of *ex post facto* jurisprudence, forthwith flogged, as a sort of sacrifice to propitiate the god of casualty. This last infliction the writer in the 'Daily News' designates as No. 3, in his 'Series of Brutalities.'

'Brutality, No. 3, is enacted by the masters, who have no means of meeting one act of cruelty than that of inflicting another. According to the ethics of Rugby, atonement is made for flinging a boy into the river by submitting to have the back scored by a rod. Here, surely, the matter ought to have ended according to the theory of the Rugby masters. The problem was to turn a couple of young tyrants into two merciful young Christians. The solution of the problem was supposed to be attained by the infliction of pain. If boys would not be good tempered, and gentle, and mild, and merciful, when their backs were smarting from recent punishment, it was no fault of the Rugby masters. The experiment, it must be allowed, was not successful. The two boys turned out into the market-place, and meeting the person who furnished the report of their cruelty towards a school-fellow to the 'Daily News,' they violently assaulted him, and thus committed brutality No. 4.'

This opens an important and a difficult question. If it be decided that corporal chastisement should in no case whatever be adopted in schools, the matter is of course disposed of. Unless, however, all this be contended for, it is difficult to conceive of a case which seemed more stringently to require its adoption. Two cowardly bullies, like those who committed the assault, would of course be utterly insensible to reproof, disgrace, or any similar form of discipline, which to high-minded boys would be far more terrible than bodily pain. Such persons as these have only one portion of their entire nature endued with sensibility, and that is the cuticle; if, therefore, it was necessary that punishment should be inflicted, flagellation was the most suitable, if not the only one of which the case admitted. To meet the demands of justice, in our opinion, the boys should, in the first instance, have been soundly whipped, and then the masters deposed, and superseded by others, who should be qualified to educate the sons of English gentlemen without making sneaking and tortured slaves of the younger classes, and barbarians and blackguards of the elder. The statement of the 'Daily News,' 'the

problem was to turn a couple of young tyrants into two merciful Christians,' seems to us to betray singular thoughtlessness. The incidence of punishment is on the conduct, and not on the character. The infliction, like the threat, may deter from the commission of guilt; but neither has the slightest relevance to the conscience and the spirit. The only influence of punishment which deserves to be called moral, is that reformatory discipline which, under certain conditions of punishment, as that of comparative seclusion, may be brought to bear on the feelings and the conscience, and that deterring effect which, by checking overt acts of guilt, removes one of the great causes of crimes, which, in their repetition, necessarily harden the heart. No man in his senses would ever expect an early conversion from a flogging. It may, though indirectly, place the subject in a more favourable moral condition, and even that in most cases is extremely doubtful; while, to use the quaint language of South, 'You might as well expect to bring a *cart* as a soul to Heaven by any such means.'

Having thus touched on the subject of fagging, this may be the proper place in which to connect it with the monitorial system, which we must presently examine, and in doing so we must avail ourselves of the experience of the two most successful modern head-masters of Rugby and Harrow.

The recent occurrences at Harrow and Rugby, which we have already detailed, has induced Lord Palmerston to address a letter to Dr. Vaughan, which, as we have already stated with regret, does not appear upon the published documents before us. Dr. Vaughan's printed reply is, however, now before us. The Head Master of Harrow chiefly screens what we must deliberately designate as his own incapacity and misconduct behind the shield of Dr. Arnold's name. On some accounts, we are disposed to speak with great reverence of Dr. Arnold. That he was a man of considerable natural talents, of great learning, and of good feeling, will not now be questioned. That he was a profound thinker, we utterly deny; that he entertained, as a consequence of this defect, a variety of crotchets, rendered the more mischievous by the energy of his character, we believe; and that he was in all main respects in a false position, we are perfectly satisfied. A priest himself, by the very terms of the rubric of his church, he exploded the notion of a Christian priesthood; too earnest a Protestant for his position, he desiderated the popish road-side mementos with which he had been familiarized by his continental travels; and endowed with not only natural but Christian humanity, he sanctioned and advocated the cowardly and abominable system of fagging. Let us look at the broken reed on which Dr. Vaughan rests the

weight of his dulness and infirmity. Hear Dr. Arnold first, on 'Corporal Punishment.' 'Corporal punishment, it is said, is degrading. I well know of what feeling this is the expression; it originates in that proud notion of personal independence which is neither reasonable nor Christian, but essentially barbarian. It visited Europe in former times with all the curses of the age of chivalry, and is threatening us now with those of Jacobinism.'

Of this dictum Dr. Vaughan makes full use, and speaks of 'modern notions of personal dignity, and modern habits of precocious manliness,' adding a reference to 'a few cases of exceptional excess in the infliction of such punishment,' to which we shall refer hereafter. Dr. Vaughan next comes to the monitorial system,—

'There are,' he says, 'in every public school, certain minor offences, against manners rather than against morals—faults of turbulence, rudeness, offensive language, annoyance of others, petty oppression and tyranny, &c.—which, as public schools are at present constituted, lie ordinarily out of the cognizance of the Masters, and might, so far as *they* are concerned, be committed with impunity. Even some *graver* faults might, with due precautions against discovery, long escape the eye of a really vigilant Master.'

This is, perhaps, the most undeniable passage in Dr. Vaughan's pamphlet. Under the merely prefatory superintendence observed by Dr. Vaughan, we can well imagine that not only minor, but the gravest offences, might be habitually committed without ever vexing his soul or reaching his ear. But here, too, he hides behind the ægis of Arnold, and cites a passage which many of the admirers of the latter will read with a blush.

'It is idle to say that the Masters form, or can form, this government; it is impossible to have a sufficient number of Masters for the purpose; for, in order to obtain the advantages of home government, the boys should be as much divided as they are at their respective homes. There should be no greater number of schoolfellows living under one Master than of brothers commonly living under one parent: nay, the number should be less, inasmuch as there is wanting that bond of natural affection which so greatly facilitates domestic government, and gives it its peculiar virtue. Even a father with thirty sons, all below the age of manhood, and above childhood, would find it no easy matter to govern them effectually—how much less can a Master govern thirty boys, with no natural bond to attach them either to him or to one another! He may indeed superintend their government of one another; he may govern them through their own governors; but to govern them immediately, and at the same time effectively, is, I believe, impossible. And hence, if you have a large *boarding-school*, you cannot have it adequately governed without a system of fagging.'

—Dr. Arnold, as above, page 372.

This respectable defence of the criminal sluggishness of a Head Master suffices to reassure Dr. Vaughan against the obloquy which his administration of Harrow has so justly incurred. He boldly writes his endorsement upon the dictum of Dr. Arnold. 'Hence,' he says, 'arises the old custom of fagging. It is a memento of monitorial authority. * * * This is the ordinary assertion of monitorial power.' Now it becomes important to inquire what is involved in this system of fagging so highly sanctioned? It involves the daily practice of the most disgusting tyranny, and the most galling degradation. The blacking of shoes and the running of errands are small matters for the sons of gentlemen to be subjected to; but cruel floggings and persecutions, and even fatal exertions of juvenile barbarism, must at least be quite as well known to the head masters of Rugby and Harrow as to ourselves, and ought to be equally notorious to the public. If our memory serves us, we owe to 'Blackwood's Magazine' the details in which one boy was drowned under circumstances precisely similar to those we have already given in our account of the late outrage at Rugby; while in another case which occurred a few years ago at one of our great public schools, a fag was punished by being placed upon a fire, and we have the testimony of the surgeon who attended him, that he died in a few days from the frightful injuries he received. The case came before a coroner's jury, but, through the influence of the school authorities, was compromised and hushed. Such cases, from their very flagrancy, are likely to become known; but who can tell, or even imagine, the daily sufferings, degradations, and tortures which happen at Harrow and Rugby, not to mention other public schools, under the supine incapacity of a Vaughan, or the cold philosophy of an Arnold.

While establishing the connexion between the monitorial system and fagging, Dr. Vaughan might fairly have mentioned fighting as an innocent adjunct of the same system. A friend of ours, who had acted as an examiner at Rugby, told us, that in crossing the play-ground in company with the master (we will not startle our readers with mentioning his name), he witnessed one of these disgusting encounters, which he understood had been proceeding for about three-quarters of an hour. He remonstrated with the master on his tacit permission of such brutalities, but was informed in reply that it was impossible to prevent them, as they were essential to the present constitution of our public schools.

We were once in a company with a barrister, educated at another of our public schools, who coolly told us, to our unspeakable disgust, that he had been the *backer* of a young gentleman, the son of one of the most respected noblemen in the British

peerage, who, after fighting for an hour and three-quarters, died upon the ground. He stated that he carried off the corpse upon his shoulders; and bitterly complained of the injustice of the newspapers, which had reported that he had plied him with brandy, whereas, he said, he had only bathed his hands with brandy when they were too much swollen to allow of his clenching his fists!

Even Dr. Vaughan seems to be aware that some supervision over the members of a public school is necessary when they are away from the master's class-room, but his observations on this subject are so utterly silly, that had we not seen his name on the title-page of his pamphlet, we should have attributed them to one of the youngest boys in the school, provided, of course, that he was *not* a fag.

'You may adopt what might with equal propriety be called the foreign school, or the private school, system. You may create a body of ushers, masters of a lower order, whose business it shall be to follow boys into their hours of recreation and rest, avowedly as spies, coercing freedom of speech and action, or reporting to their superior what such observation has gleaned. This is consistent and intelligible. Ruinous to that which has been regarded as the great glory of an English public school—its free development of character, its social expansiveness, in short, its *liberty*.'

Free development of character!—Social expansiveness!—Liberty! With an honest desire to avoid the use of intemperate language towards gentlemen occupying such a position as Dr. Vaughan's, can we, after the details previously published respecting Harrow School, designate this otherwise than as a most impudent affront to the common-sense of society? Elder boys, it appears, are to supplement a head master's laziness; armed with his authority and his cane, to engage with their fellows at foot-ball or cricket, on the ordinary terms of the game; to violate, at their arbitrary will, all the recognised laws of play; to charge on their schoolfellows falsehood and unfairness; and if a word of remonstrance is uttered, to inflict a brutal punishment on the high-minded boy who incurs their displeasure; and this for the sake of the honour and glory of our public schools, and for its free development of character, its social expansiveness, in short, its *liberty*! These are the principles of moral education entertained by Dr. Vaughan, Head Master of Harrow School. In all such cases, however gross the injustice and tyranny of the boy who bears the function of monitor, he does not hesitate to constitute him the plaintiff, the jury, the judge, and the executioner, to the very top of his tyrannical bent.

Dr. Vaughan condemns the employment of subordinate masters to superintend the boys out of school hours as a system of

espionnage, under which the superintendent would be hated by the boys as a spy ; but does Dr. Vaughan think it impossible that high-minded men might be selected as subordinate masters—men with sufficient personal dignity and self-respect even to join in the amusements of their pupils without damage to their authority, and, by the union of gentleness, authority, and quiet remonstrance, to chasten their characters, while they insured their respectful affection ? If Dr. Vaughan cannot imagine men so qualified, we can. But, forsooth, even the monitors themselves must not be limited to the function of reporting misconduct to the master, but must be entrusted with the cane, to be used at their own discretion ; otherwise, he tells us, they would say—‘ We did not come here to be ushers ;’ but it does not occur to this short-sighted man that a generous boy like young Stewart (for example), whose nobility of behaviour, by the way, deserves the highest praise, and casts Dr. Vaughan and Platt together into the shade and slough of absolute plebeianism, might also exclaim, under the impulse of a higher virtue—‘ I did not come here to be a Jack Ketch.’

Dr. Vaughan intimated in his letter to Lord Palmerston, that this system shall not be changed while he is head master of Harrow. We rejoice to hear it, for as this detestable state of things will inevitably be blown away before the blast of popular censure, the public will be rid of a master as naturally and incurably incompetent to govern Harrow School as he is to occupy the Woolsack or to take the command of the fleet in the Baltic.

Nothing can be conceived more lamentable in its way than this late affair at Harrow, the details of which have been given at the commencement of this article. The monitorial system had existed, it appears, before Dr. Vaughan’s accession to office, though previously ignored. It was, however, thenceforth recognised and legalized by his own regulations ; and under these the pretended offence was committed. Its particulars, by an exception, and which from the evidence was occasioned by the private ill-will of the monitor, Platt, to Mr. Stewart, were made known to Dr. Vaughan. He sanctioned the infliction of the punishment by Platt, and recommended submission to Stewart. All the monitors were present, all consented to the infliction, and not one uttered a word of remonstrance against the prolonged brutality of the execution. The injuries inflicted necessitated a surgical report, and under all the torture of the punishment, young Stewart pens a letter to his father, in which he says that Dr. Vaughan was ‘ excessively kind’ to him in the interview. An apologist in the ‘ Times’ declares that this severity must have been an exceptional case, and yet, with singular obtuseness of logic, adds, that if the sufferer, instead of being a young gentleman, had been named Stubbs or Grubbs,

the matter never would have come before the public. This of itself implies, especially as coming from a public school boy, that such occurrences are common. We have already taken occasion to observe, that the very paucity of evidence as to cruelties practised in monastic institutions constitutes a reason for a searching and authoritative supervision; and we say again, that the same surveillance is equally required in our public schools. Lord John Russell, in the late debate, expressed his conviction that no English gentleman would suffer his children to be ill treated; and yet here is the son of an English gentleman forced through a stream in November, and then thrashed while being dragged by the hair of his head; and the son of a British peer caned by a brutal monitor until he is necessarily confined to his bed for days, and had his health been delicate, would probably have carried his injuries to an early grave.

We will not speak of the young tyrant in this latter case, further than to say that he can only be protected by the circumstance of his youth, and the hateful influences under which he has been educated, from the lasting punishment of expulsion from all respectable society. His shabby apology for an apology to Mr. Stewart, which he requested him to burn as soon as he had read it, stamps his character at once as unutterably mean, while the reply of young Stewart, desiring to stand with him on the same terms as before, evinces a generosity which is to our minds exceedingly touching. Of the conduct of Mr. Baron Platt and Dr. Vaughan, we can scarcely trust ourselves to speak freely. The Judge at once accepts the ex-parte statement of his son, declares his conduct as unexceptionable, and uses language to the Head Master with respect to his degradation from the monitorship, which can only be interpreted as a courteous threat. We hear, sometimes, a panegyric peculiarly British, on what is called the judicial mind—a purity of judgment incapable of personal bias—which alone befits the ermine and the dignity of the Bench. But how can this be ascribed to Mr. Baron Platt, who at once rushes into the lists in favour of the aggressor, and designates the victim as ‘a contumacious boy, smarting with resentment and the mortification of wounded pride;’ on which the Earl comments, with his accustomed gentleness, ‘that he was a generous boy, “smarting,” indeed, but not “with resentment,” and “wounded,” indeed (though short of “mortification”), but not with “pride.”’ Our readers will probably hope that they may never be brought before Mr. Baron Platt in a case of brutal assault, except, indeed, as criminals, in which case they may hope to be dismissed from court as of unexceptionable character.

Of Dr. Vaughan’s conduct throughout this disgusting case, we feel it difficult to speak in such terms as fall within the limits of

fair and honourable criticism. He first sanctions, and, by his authoritative limitations, prescribes the system under which these abominations are practised, which, as we are told by their defenders, would have been confined, as to the knowledge of others, to the precincts of Harrow, had the victim been a 'Stubbs' or a 'Grubbs.' He hears the nominal offence, which had it been committed against any other player in the game would have been no offence at all. He declines to hear the defence; he sanctions the infliction of an unlimited punishment by a tyrannical coxcomb, who in his letter to his father only condescends to name him as 'Vaughan' (a piece of puppyism which, though Mr. Baron Platt does not notice it, deserved a sound application of the birch); he then degrades Platt for the very act he had sanctioned, and next, if Platt is to be believed, assured him that he punished him not because he thought he deserved it, but solely from regard to what people might say. We say, 'if Platt is to be believed;' but we must remember that he had probably been himself a fag, and that servitude and degradation are the natural parents of falsehood. This may be a lie, and Dr. Vaughan may not have so utterly disgraced himself as to have adopted this contemptible shift. If Platt has not been guilty of the most direct and calumnious falsehood, Dr. Vaughan ought immediately to be deposed from the head mastership of Harrow School.

And now, to review the case in a few words;—what is the character which the system of our public schools (for we are taught by the best evidence supplied by the London press to believe that they are all alike) must necessarily impress on the rising gentry and aristocracy of this country? We suggest the answer without hesitation. From ten years old to fourteen, mental degradation, cowardice, and duplicity; thence to eighteen, selfishness, cruelty, and despotism. An advocate in the 'Times' declares that they have produced our brightest ornaments in Church and State. In a few select instances we grant this to be true; but we think it capable of demonstration that their eminence was in spite of their training, and not in consequence of it. One of the greatest men of this generation has recorded his opinion in the 'Edinburgh Review,' that feebleness of intellect and contractedness of general principles are the characteristics of the students of our universities, which, as is well known, are mainly supplied by our public schools. Of our universities we say nothing. We well recollect the peculiar expression of countenance with which John Foster once designated them to us as the 'starry eyes of Europe,' and we have no hesitation in characterizing them as the most useless corporations, as compared with their bulk and pretension, in the whole civilized world. But against their nurseries, the public schools, we must bring a heavier charge: their system

operating on the more plastic mind of youth is, as at present constituted, only fitted to create a character of servility and selfishness; tyranny in the state, represented by the judge who said that 'the people had nothing to do with the laws but to obey them,' and by the boroughmongering duke, who declared 'he might do what he would with his own;' while in the Church, commencing with a sneaking servitude, and going on to an unmanly despotism, it matures the character of a Laud, a Bonner, and a Horsley; fostering all the passions which the Christian religion condemns, and inciting to acts over which it hangs the denunciations of a righteous retribution.

ART. VIII.—*A Bill to Make Better Provision for the Management of Episcopal and Capitular Estates.*

2. *A Bill to Relieve the Clergy of the United Church of England and Ireland, Resident in the Colonies, from any Disability as to the Holding^g of Meetings in such Colonies for the Regulation of Ecclesiastical Affairs therein.*
3. *A Bill to Continue Her Majesty's Commission for Building New Churches.*
4. *A Bill to Amend the Law Relating to Ministers' Money and the Church Temporalities (Ireland) Act.*
5. *A Bill to Make Further Provision for the Good Government and Extension of the University of Oxford and of the Colleges therein.*

Bills ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, Session 1854.

UP to the moment at which we are writing, there have been during this present session fifty-four divisions in the House of Commons. Twenty-six of them have been taken on ecclesiastical questions, and, in all, the government has voted *against* the side of religious liberty. In many of these divisions they have been left in a minority by their ordinary supporters, and have been saved from defeat by the more congenial temperament of the opposition members. Such was the case, for instance, in the divisions on the ministers' money question; in one only of which, out of seven, a severe whip of their immediate satellites, and a friendly rescinding of their former votes on the part of Messrs. W. Brown, Sir B. Hall, W. O. Stanley, R. A. Thicknesse, and James Whatnan, obtained for them a majority of two without counting their Derbyite supporters.

Nor can we recognise the measures of the government as founding any more satisfactory claim than their votes, to the

support which dissenting members have hitherto rendered them, as freely, it must be admitted, and we rather think more reliably, than any other section of members on the liberal side of the House. Remembering what passed, and what is passing, with reference to the Charitable Trusts and Canadian Clergy Reserves Acts, and the Dissenters' Marriages and Chapels' Registration Bills of last session, and the Irish Ministers' Money Bill, the Colonial Clergy Reserves Bill, the Church Building Acts Continuance Bill, the Oxford Reform Bill, and Lord Blandford's Episcopal and Capitular Estates Bill—we cannot yet say anybody's Church-rate Abolition Bill—of this session, remembering all this, we can have no hesitation in endorsing the declaration of a dissenting M.P. high in general confidence: 'The coalition government is formed upon the basis of giving the dissenters nothing; and I am glad it is so, for that tells us what we have to do.'

We have commented upon some of these measures as occasion brought them into our monthly summaries. But it will, we think, place beyond cavil the view which we are desirous to lay before our readers of the actual relations between the government and the dissenters, if we now shortly state the points in each together.

The Charitable Trusts Act was a wise, just, and necessary measure. We would have consented that there should be no exemptions from it. We mean, deliberately, that we should have been willing, in order to avoid difficulty, that even such cases should have been included as, although not within the mischief to be remedied, were brought within the Act by the unavoidable exigencies of language. But if there were to be exemptions, they should be framed upon a recognisable principle, and, subject to the above limitation, should be conceded to all the cases within it. Now we have received communications from many dissenters, whose cases are evidently but types of a class, and who now find themselves uncovered by the rigid narrowness of the provisions introduced on their behalf. Meanwhile, all the Roman-catholic foundations in the kingdom are exempted in the lump for two years, with the understanding that they may, during that period, legislate themselves wholly out of the Act. We are not anxious to make complaint that in the first print of the bill London University was not named, like Durham, along with Oxford and Cambridge. It had hardly then acquired the position which rendered it likely to be recollected by the draftsmen of acts of parliament; and, indeed, it is still, unlike Durham, only a government board. But its claim to equality was represented to Lord Aberdeen in a memorial signed by most of the College 'Heads,' and was immediately recognised, with his expressed approval and that of the Lord Chancellor, by the House of Lords. When,

however, the exemption clause came up in the Commons, London University and its Colleges were again struck out, on the motion of the Solicitor-General, without notice to the House, and without communication to the memorialists. Upon urgent remonstrances, Lord Aberdeen offered to restore the University, but not the Colleges. The offer was declined, and the government only gained their point by the aid of the Derbyite benches. Now, the catholic seminaries, it will be observed, are provided for by the two years' clause ; and in asserting our belief that this policy was expressly aimed at the dissenting colleges, we speak of that in which we were at the time personally engaged, and in which our communications were so direct and distinct as to warrant us in now declining to accept any denial of the animus we have imputed. The hostile interference originated with a former colleague of Lord John Russell's, now a leading senator of London University.

The passage of the Canadian Clergy Reserves Act has been frequently since referred to as a painful story. Introduced by Sir W. Molesworth for the avowed purpose of conceding to the colony the control of its ecclesiastical as well as its other affairs, and of freeing the mother country from all further liability as well as control therein, it was afterwards altered by Lord John Russell for the purpose of securing to the colonial clergy an imperial guarantee. The discovery that this guarantee was invalid is generally acknowledged to have saved the bill on the third reading. Mr. Gladstone, however, it will be remembered, stated his belief that the Colonial Legislature would not secularize the clergy reserves. We must now add the information of complaints recently received in this country from a responsible source, of a probably successful attempt on the part of the colonial office to verify this belief. An union is being effected, as is understood under its auspices, between the Episcopalian and Catholic parties in the Canadian legislature, for the purpose of preventing the late act from being carried out by the colony.

'When Lysander found the lion's skin too short, he eked it out with a fox's.' The hold which the tractarian party in the Church have obtained of the colonial pulpit has proved fatal, by the jealousy it has awakened at home, to all the Protean efforts of Mr. Gladstone to obtain for them legislative power. From 1850 downwards we have waded, somewhat painfully, through all Mr. Gladstone's bishops' and clergy bills, and all the debates upon them. We cannot complain that our labour was unprofitable, for we are conscious of having obtained by means of it a distincter conception of the character of Bottom's dream. 'It was past the wit of man to find out what it was like.' The measure now before the House comprises as much bewilderment in its solitary section as all the

multitudinous provisos of its predecessors together. It professes to enable the metropolitans and clergy of colonial dioceses to meet and agree upon regulations, &c.; but such regulations are to have no force by virtue of the act which authorizes their passing. It seems to have had all the effect upon the House that Sin is represented as producing upon the heavenly host. At first it was, we believe, in some danger of being passed from the apparent impossibility of its being otherwise than harmless. At length suspicion was awakened, and several gentlemen tried their hands at rendering the bill innocuous. Sir John Pakington on one side, and Mr. Dunlop, Mr. Miall, and Mr. W. J. Fox on the other, framed clauses which, if carried, will, in all probability, take all the virtue (or vice) out of the measure. To Mr. Dunlop belongs the merit of an exact perception and an artistic avoidance of the point of danger. *The grand evil of the bill consists in its words.* No Act of Parliament has up to this time recognised a colonial 'metropolitan' or 'diocese,' nor, consequently, a colonial bishop, having, as such, territorial jurisdiction by law; nor, consequently, an Established Church in the colonies. The passing of a measure using these terms would have been a legislative recognition of its existence, which time and events would develop at leisure. Mr. Dunlop proposed to strike out the technical words, and to replace them by equivalent expressions, differing only in not carrying with them the force of a *verbum artis*. It had also been observed that, although the regulations of the new colonial synods were not to be *law*, they would undoubtedly be *legal*, so that bishops could act under their sanction in a way from which the very arbitrariness of their present power precludes them; and the avowed authorship of the measure among the colonial episcopate justified the assumption that one great object of the bill was to render the bishops' power practically usable. To meet this double danger, Mr. Miall proposed an amendment rendering nugatory any act done by the bishop by virtue of any synodical regulation. Mr. Dunlop has, we hope, practically succeeded. He certainly had the House distinctly with him upon the point of—No Established Church in the Colonies. The other amendments have yet to be discussed. But it has needed all the watchfulness of our members merely to be in a condition to oppose a measure for establishing the Church of England in the colonies, and enormously increasing its powers; and this just at the moment when Lord John Russell is telling public meetings of his gratification in that the colonies are now being left to themselves, and that all interference from the home government is at an end.

With respect to the Dissenters' Marriage and Chapel Registration Bills, we think dissenters can hardly be aware of the points

involved in them. Lord John Russell, it will be remembered, withdrew them at the close of last session on the ground of 'difficulties' having arisen. It was then understood that objection was taken on the part of the Unitarians to being compelled to register themselves by their distinctive denominational name, and that they objected to the bills passing at all on the ground that the title 'Protestant Dissenters' was sufficient for all the purposes of the law—a view of the case, which, when first presented to us, undoubtedly did not command much of our sympathy. Further communications have satisfied us, and we think will enable us to satisfy our readers, that in whatever shape the objection may have been taken, the principle of it lies much deeper. The objection is really one of evidence. With whatever safeguard it be necessary to surround the marriage ceremony, it is all important that, that ceremony once performed, its proof shall be easy and indisputable. Thus only can you secure the peace of families and the due succession to property. Upon this principle it was always the rule, that although marriage must be solemnized in some *place* provided or recognised by law, *proof* on that point should not afterwards be required. The production of the proper officer's books, or of a certified extract recording the *fact* of marriage, was always sufficient. So it was in our churches; but so it is *not* in our chapels. According to the present law, and according to the bills to which objection is made, it is part of the necessary proof of a dissenter's marriage to show that the chapel in which the ceremony was performed was a place legally registered by compliance with all the technical provisions of the Registration Act. Were the objection to this a point of honour only, it ought not to be slighted. But it is one of grave practical importance. Doubts are intimated at the Registrar-General's office whether, owing to a mistake in the late act, any dissenting chapel can now be legally registered for the purposes of marriage, and consequently whether any marriage celebrated in a dissenting chapel since the date of the act is valid. We believe that the Committee of Deputies, the Liberation of Religion Society, and the Presbyterian Board, are now united in a determination to alter the bills.

Irish ministers' money is a tax of one shilling in the pound, imposed by an act of Charles II. for the benefit of the Protestant incumbent. It is levied only on the principal Catholic towns of Ireland, Protestant Ulster being exempted. The tax has worse incidents, but the above are to be perpetuated by the bill which the government perseveres in pressing. In 1848, a select committee of the House of Commons recommended its abolition, and the provision of a substitute from the (Irish) ecclesiastical commission fund. The fund, which was then reported

adequate, has now permanently doubled, and is in course of further increase; and during the last two years the commissioners have funded £60,000 from their surplus revenue. In the face of these facts the government resisted Mr. Fagan's motion for giving effect to the recommendations of the select committee; and the seven divisions to which we alluded at the outset, in which one hundred and sixty* of their supporters voted against them, were submitted to for the sake of saving to the church £15,000, or as Sir John Young says £7500 a year. By the seriousness of the risk, we may estimate the value attached to the object. That object is the preservation of the taxing power of the 'establishment'—in England, we may be assured, as well as in Ireland. The opposition lobby was seen to be filled with dissenters more than with Irish members, and the battle fought was not for ministers' money but for church-rates.

Our readers will hardly require us to complete in full detail an induction in which we already fear to have become wearisome. Lord Palmerston has been strongly pressed for his Church Rate Abolition Bill. It is not yet prepared; and since the last question in the House, it is said that an immediate subordinate at the Home-office has descended to the subterfuge of explaining that his lordship's expression of 'not ready until after Easter' was not the same thing as a promise that the bill should then be 'brought in.' Meantime (to say nothing of the obvious significance of the Ministers' Money Bill), Lord Blandford's bill precluding the application, as a church-rate substitute, of the surplus income of the episcopal and capitular estates, is being pressed on with government connivance. We use the word 'connivance,' knowing that Lord Palmerston's attention has been specially called to the point, and that nothing is being done. The one great concession which Mr. Hadfield's energy has extorted is the limitation to two years instead of ten of the Church Building Acts Continuance Bill; of which none of its promoters profess to know anything except that Mr. Horsman knows too much.

Without dwelling, then, on these, not minor details—for the church-rate bill alone will be a test of the government disposition worth all the experiences of a session—we proceed at once to the Oxford University Reform Bill. Short of their actual admission, nothing could well have been more satisfactory to dissenters than the apparent spirit in which this measure was introduced and received. But as Sir Robert Inglis said, on the introduction of the Ecclesiastical Titles Act, we must thank Lord John Russell more for his speech than for his bill. The latter has

* The number is usually stated at 120. The last four divisions raised it to 160.

already become unsatisfactory even to those who are only anxious for a reform measure. Among gentlemen of this class it is common to hear something like sharp practice imputed to Lord John Russell in having obtained general sympathy for a bill which in real effect and animus differs so materially from his speech. It is common also to hear him exonerated on the ground that he could not be expected to be personally acquainted with its details, and that he, in fact, relied wholly on Mr. Gladstone. Mr. Gladstone, again, is excused on the ground of the impossibility, without abundant exercise of diplomacy and its incidents, of bringing together two such discordant elements as Oxford and Lord John Russell. It is urged that if the latter had been made fully percipient of the actual results of his measure, he would never have committed himself to its introduction; and, on the other hand, that if the bill had not contained every guarantee against its own working, it would never have been allowed to reach the Lords. However this may be, and we certainly believe that there is truth in it, the bill is not that grand measure of University reform which the dissenters have been quietly but industriously charged with sectarianism for jeopardizing, by the inopportune obtrusion of their 'private and particular' claims. It is not the one government measure with which the war is not to be allowed to interfere, or which cannot be made far more valuable by the delay of a session. The three great points of Oxford reform were the following. The University was to be emancipated from the despotism of the college 'Heads'; a liberalizing spirit was to be imparted and secured to its future government by means chiefly of the effective organization of the professoriat; and by a redistribution of fellowships, the large endowments of the colleges were to be made available to general merit. By the actual measure the first and third of these objects are not secured, and the second is to all appearance precluded. A few words as to each point. According to the new constitution of the University nineteen members out of the twenty-five of the hebdomadal council are to be elected and removable by congregation; with which, by virtue of its other powers, it is generally agreed that the supreme power in the University will practically rest. In this body the collegiate element prevails in the proportion of about 200 to 30; and of the sections of which the collegiate element is composed twenty-four *are* 'Heads,' about one hundred (tutors) are appointed and removable at their pleasure, and almost the entire remainder, although having ceased to be removable, owe to them their appointment and position. If, instead of the expression 'not secured,' we had said 'frustrated,' we think that upon these facts we should hardly have been accused of an over-statement. We must add that the

subordinate details appear to us to be carefully arranged to the same end. To select one instance. The weight of the professors must be affected by their independence, and that must depend upon the provision for their endowment. This is to be obtained from the college fellowships. But no college need contribute unless it has twenty fellowships; and colleges may raise the value of their fellowships, and so diminish the number, to an extent which enables them to render this portion of the bill practically inoperative. We sincerely wish that the proofs were not already before the public of their willingness to do so.

With regard to the second object, the retention of predominating influence on the part of the college Heads will be felt, we think, to justify our complaint of its frustration. But we may say also that if the present ecclesiastical tendencies of the University are surely strong enough in themselves to prevent any fear of a liberalizing spirit appearing in its action, those tendencies are aggravated by the bill. The effect of clauses 35 and 36 is, admittedly, to increase considerably the relative number of fellows in holy orders; and of these, it is odd to note, as showing the minute caution of the anti-reforming party, that a longer tenure of their fellowship is obtained for clerks, who will practically have received their licenses from the Bishop of Oxford, and being residents will have most power of making their position available. Well might Mr. Gladstone say 'we have conceded ourselves out of all opposition.' The question has begun to be, What is left, worthy of it?

The third change, that of opening the college fellowships has a great appearance—not so great, however, but that the friends of the bill are able to make its non-existence the ground of their non-interference on behalf of dissenters. It is said to us freely, and with every appearance of good faith, that the government measure is merely an organization bill; that if it effected any redistribution of revenues, the dissenters would be fairly entitled to complain of being excluded from its benefits; but that inasmuch as it is merely intended to put the University in a position facilitating the very change they want, it is unreasonable in them to reject what is so obviously a large instalment of their claim. The force of this is so much relied on, that it is even said to be now the intention of the cabinet to oppose Mr. Heywood's motion on that ground. Really we are rather at a loss to deal with either the facts or the arguments. We are first told that we ought to help in forcing the bill through the legislature, because it opens the college fellowships; and upon our asking why we should be acting parties to confining this benefit to one religious denomination, it is immediately replied to us, that, practically speaking, the college fellowships will remain pretty much as they

are, having long become to a large extent by custom the open endowments which it is now proposed they should be by law; and that all that the bill does is, by an improved organization, to render the University more probably willing to admit dissenters at some future time. As it is conceded on all hands that a merely enabling bill would not suffice for the smaller changes in contemplation, but that compulsory provisions are essential even for these, we should hardly in any case be enamoured of the offer thus made to us; but when the effect of the proposed changes in rendering the opening of the Universities still more unlikely than ever, is, to say the least, so easily possible, we confess to thinking it is about the last in which a feeling of self-respect would induce us to acquiesce. If one thing more were required to make even suspicion impossible, it would be the selection of commissioners. The Earl of Ellesmere, the Bishop of Ripon, the Dean of Wells, Mr. Justice *Coleridge*, and Sir *John Awdrey*, the two last being the leading spirits, are surely equivalent to 'No Dissenter need apply.' The strong leanings of Mr. Justice Coleridge led him even to the judicial declaration (in *Gosling v. Veley*) that the common law ought to be considered as having within it an expansive power, capable of providing new punishment for church-rate recusants, for whom excommunication and interdict had no longer terrors; while among the most explicit claimants of 'Oxford for the Church,' and repudiants of parliamentary 'confiscation' of collegiate, because private, endowments, Sir John Awdrey figures first. It is but just to say that when consenting to his nomination, we believe Lord John Russell to have been wholly unaware of his antecedents. It was probably one of the 'diplomatic incidents' to which we have been referred.

Here, then, is an unbroken series of measures, in which all that dissenters do not wish done is pressed forward, all for which they are anxious kept back, and even opportunities seem to be taken of specially excepting them from the benefit of concessions. It is no longer that the government do not go so far as some dissenters desire; it is that they have altogether given them up. It is no longer the whigs of whom we complain, it is the Coalition. And such being the settled policy of the Coalition, is it to count upon the dissenters in the House and in the country as its staunchest adherents, on the mere memory of the old Russell battle-cry of religious freedom? In 1835 we adhered to the whigs against Sir R. Peel, because they acknowledged the right, while he would only concede the boon. They have now joined his followers in refusing either, and they have won nearly every division against us, and not unnaturally, by the aid of those for whom Sir R. Peel was too liberal. *But are we to let in Lord Derby?* Well: our question leads to no such conclusion. I

ought not, and we hope it will not. What we ask is this,—Is the present basis of ministerial votes and measures to continue to be the basis upon which dissenting support is to be rendered? The government being, as a coalition, avowedly one of concession, is the concession to be all on one side? Of the new triumvirate, are the friends of one party only to be the proscribed, and are they to be consenting parties to the proscription? Is the government—friendly to religious liberty in the person of a Catholic, and amicably neutral in his case where it cannot be amicably active, witness its indifference to Mr. Spooner, its opposition to Mr. Chambers, and its goodwill to Mr. Lucas—to be sternly hostile to it in any shape of a dissenter? Is it to be the *mot d'ordre* among the constituencies, that the new elections are to proceed upon this understanding?—We believe that if the dissenting M.P.'s will only think so, they already hold the balance of party in the House. They are not less numerous, and they have unquestionably more weight (or, if they have not, the fault is their own), by their known principle, their personal character, and the importance of their constituencies,—they have more weight certainly than the Irish members. But the Irish members can at least defend their constituents against ministerial aggression,—aggression, too, from a government against which the majority of them have already done their worst by uniting with the opposition. Let the dissenters, then, if they will, give the Coalition their support; but let it be a reasonable, let it be an honourable support. Let them not be just the members against whom something very like a dead set is to be made by the government policy, and who do *not* need the 'whip' on a close division. Let them show that they are not terrified by the half-hinted threat of a dissolution, which will only increase their own numbers in the House. Let them make just the difference of supporting their principles first, and the government second, instead of urging their principles only so far as consists with the convenience of the Coalition, and they will not then commit the mistake into which some of them are falling, of supporting the government in opposition to their principles. With all respect, but with much earnestness, we do not think they have done all that their position in the House, and as they must now begin to feel the support which has been waiting for them in the country, would, well-used, have enabled them to do. The division lists show, that, exclusive of 'arranged votes,' they may reckon on from eighty to one hundred members as reliable,—a number larger than the difference between the two sides of the House. The number of members who would gladly see the government moving towards them is much larger. The number who would be greatly influenced by their decided stand, not only from their

personal convictions, but from their knowledge of the prevailing feeling of their constituents, is by no means despicable. Of the one hundred and sixty liberal members who voted against the government on the Ministers' Money divisions, some undoubtedly voted to please themselves, some to please their constituents;—none certainly to please the government. One of their staunchest friends in the House is known to have regretted the support he gave them, and has since made his weight felt on the dissenters' side. It is idle to say that these eighty votes—we take the smallest number—thus circumstanced, must always be so managed as to be thrown away. It is unreasonable to expect that we out of doors should be so satisfied. Let us not hear of difficulties; we know all about them, and that difficulties are things to be overcome. In 1832, the mistake was made which will not be repeated, of dissenters trusting their interests to a Church parliament. They will trust in future, our friends in the House may rely on it, to those who are with them *on* principle, and not against it. But where they trust, they must also look.

Brief Notices.

CONTENTS.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Origin, Progress, and Decline of the Ottoman Empire. | 12. The Bible our Strength, &c. |
| 2. Gilfillan's Poets. | 13. Sunshine of Greystone. |
| 3. Hester and Elinor. | 14. The Mystery Unveiled. |
| 4. Russia. | 15. The Lessons in Proverbs. |
| 5. i. Great Truths in Little Stories.—ii. Tales of a Large Family. | 16. The Hiding-place. |
| 6. The Boatman of the Bosphorus. | 17. The Book of Nature. |
| 7. Facts without Fiction. | 18. Chronology of Rome. |
| 8. Female Scripture Characters. | 19. Robert Hall. |
| 9. Biblical Commentary—Hebrews. | 20. Political Economy illustrated by Sacred History. |
| 10. Compendium of Ecclesiastical History. | 21. i. What is Conscience?—ii. What is the Human Soul? |
| 11. Egypt and the Bible. | 22. Miscellaneous. |

Turkey; or, a History of the Origin, Progress, and Decline of the Ottoman Empire. By George Fowler, Author of 'Lives of the Sovereigns of Russia.' With Illustrative Notes, by Trevethan Spicer, LL.D., M.A. London: T. H. Rees; Hope and Co., 1854.

A good and impartial history of the Ottoman empire is much wanted, and would in the present crisis be of great service. But we are sorry to say that the present volume does not satisfy our expectation. The author tells us that 'his volume may be deemed a sort of *travel history*; as the *gatherings* from *his rough leaves*, which were *dotted down* during

his many wanderings in that country; comprising, likewise, some report of the Sultan's court, of the seraglio, and other information relative to the government of the Grand Signior.' These lines are a fair specimen of the author. He has not studied the works of D'Ohsson and Von Hammer; his only sources are Gibbon and the 'Lives of the Sovereigns of Russia,' that is to say, himself. We are not, therefore, astonished when he assures us that 'we see in the finest portions of the globe, which, for the last four centuries, have been subjected to the Moslem rule, where the Cross once triumphed, but where the Crescent now rules, the light of truth extinguished, and supplanted by imposture,—the vital spark of liberty crushed, and *slavery reigning rampant over a people* who formerly breathed the air of freedom—viz., the natives of the once Greek empire!' Mr. Fowler seems not to be aware that the Byzantine empire was not a Greek but a Roman empire, and that from its beginning, under Constantine the Great, or, if he chooses, under Arcadius, down to its fall under Constantine XI., it never had free institutions, being kept under the yoke of the most absolute despotism, which never acknowledged, or even professed to acknowledge, the principles of civil or religious liberty.

Mr. Fowler thinks, likewise, that 'those very provinces of which Russia has now taken possession, would, no doubt, *under Russian protection*, and regular government, however tyrannical and restrictive, increase their agricultural and commercial wealth to an indefinite extent; but so long as they remain under the maladministration of the Turk, who is neither a farmer nor a man of business, and thinks it beneath the dignity of his character to follow any other profession than that of a soldier and a tax-gatherer, and who thinks all farmers and merchants only the legitimate prey of aghas and pashas, there is no hope of amelioration. (p. 300.) Our author may have long resided in the East, but it is difficult to guess where he obtained such notions. Has he really never seen Turkish merchants in the principal cities of the empire? Has he never seen Turkish farmers and agriculturists all over Asia Minor? Has he never heard anything about the constitution of Moldavia and Wallachia? He should know, at least, that no Turk is allowed to hold landed property in the Danubian principalities; that no Turkish garrisons are kept in Moldavia and Wallachia; that these provinces elect their own princes without constraint, and that the Turks cannot interfere in their domestic administration. No pasha, and no agha, has ever gathered taxes beyond the Danube, and it is therefore ridiculous to accuse the Turks of maladministration in those provinces. The Danubian provinces are as independent of Turkey as Canada is of Great Britain. Mr. Fowler should have studied the facts before passing such a judgment on Turkey. As another proof of the flippant way in which he writes his *Travel History*, we may mention that, in page 360, he describes Mosul, without making any allusion to Botta's and Layard's excavations, or to Rawlinson's and other discoveries. He says,—'At Numia, a small village on the other bank, is the site of Nineveh, but the ruins of Assyrian and Babylonian towns *being mostly of brick* (!) cannot be easily identified.' And such statements are printed in 1854!

The Poetical Works of Goldsmith, Collins, and T. Warton; with Lives, Critical Dissertations, and Explanatory Notes. By the Rev. George Gilfillan. 8vo. pp. 303. Edinburgh: James Nichol.

THIS is the last volume of the first year's issue of the 'Library Edition of the British Poets,' and it is simple justice to say, that the publisher and editor have faithfully performed their contract. Six such volumes as the one before us, at the small price of one guinea, fully entitle Mr. Nichol to meet his subscribers 'without fear of being charged with having overlooked the conditions on which he solicited and obtained their countenance to his undertaking.' For accuracy of text, elegance of appearance, and extreme cheapness, this edition has no rival, and we are glad to hear that it has obtained extensive circulation. The present volume contains the productions of three poets—Goldsmith, Collins, and T. Warton—the first two of whom are amongst our favorites, and will ever retain a strong hold on the admiration of the intelligent and tasteful of our countrymen. Mr. Gilfillan's introductory dissertations to these poets are amongst the best pieces of his writings. The previous labours of Prior, Forster, and Irving have not left much to be said respecting Goldsmith; but his literary biography and character are briefly sketched with a fondness which commands our sympathy, and a discrimination that does honor to the editor. The foibles of Goldsmith were obvious to all. They lay on the surface, and awakened the smile of his associates. Yet his death at the comparatively early age of forty-five, as Mr. Gilfillan truly remarks, 'was a severe blow to that brilliant circle of which he had been long the love, the admiration, the wonder, and the sport. Burke shed tears at the news. Reynolds dropped his pencil, and painted no more that day. Johnson said, 'Goldy was wild, sir—very wild—but he is *so NO MORE.*' Goldsmith's poetry is amongst the most pleasing in our language. Its subdued and graceful beauties will never lose their charm, and we are, therefore, glad to receive such an edition of them as the present.

Collins is also a great favourite with us, but in reading his productions we are never free from the impression of our pleasure having been purchased at a terrible cost to the author. Genius is a fearful heritage. That of Collins was of a highly imaginative order. 'He was a painter of shadows and gigantic ghosts;' and in following his career to his melancholy close, we cannot divest ourselves of the notion of his having been terrified by his own creations. His Odes to the 'Passions,' to 'Liberty,' and to 'Evening,' are amongst the most inimitable productions of the poetical faculty.

Of Warton we say little; he is not a favorite with us. Mr. Gilfillan speaks of him in much higher terms than we are disposed to employ; nor can we agree in thinking that his poetical works are entitled to be bound up 'in the same volume with those of Goldsmith and Collins.' We would not give a single page from 'The Traveller,' 'The Deserted Village,' or the 'Ode to the Passions,' for all the so-called poetry which Warton ever wrote.

Hester and Elinor; or, the Discipline of Suffering. A Tale. 12mo. pp. 473. London: John Chapman.

WE have read through this volume with very considerable interest. It must not be regarded as a mere novel. The author, whoever he may be, has evidently a higher object in view than that of whiling away a passing hour by a succession of stirring scenes. He deals with the *subjective* rather than the *objective*, and treats more of the consciousness and experience of individual minds, than with the course of events and the varied scenery through which his personages pass. The imagination, indeed, is not unaddressed, but it is always in subservience to other and more practical faculties. The growth of mind, the formation of character, the effect of circumstances as constituting the discipline of life, are the topics dwelt on, and from which the interest of the volume is mainly derived. There is, however, one serious defect pervading the work, which greatly militates against the pleasure it imparts. Evangelical religion is uniformly caricatured. The personages introduced as its representatives are unamiable, narrow-minded, saintly hypocrites, who veil under its profession much secularity and selfishness. Mr. Lewis and Mr. Gordon are types of this class. We do not deny that there are such, but what we complain of is, that they should be represented as the genuine exponents of evangelicism. There is wretched taste as well as untruthfulness in this, and the author of 'Hester and Elinor' ought to have been superior to it. Let such sanctimoniousness be reprobated wherever it is found; but let justice be done at the same time to that more genuine and divine life which has been, in every age, the prolific source of human charity and self-renunciation. The character and history of Hester are unnatural. They are out of keeping with the probabilities of the case, and being so, they fail to administer any useful lesson. The shock experienced by Hester was no doubt great, but it fails to account for what followed. There is also a want of unity in the work, which consists rather of two tales than of one. It is only at the commencement and close of the volume that the fortunes of Annie and Elinor on the one hand, and those of Hester on the other, are united. For the most part they are distinct, as much so as if narrated in separate volumes. Notwithstanding these defects, the volume is one of considerable power, and in the light which it throws on the growth of habits and the formation of character it is entitled to much praise.

Russia. From the French of the Marquis de Custine. In Three Parts. London: Longman and Co.

THIS volume, consisting of three *parts* of the 'Traveller's Library,' pertains to a topic of special interest at the present moment. It is an abridgment of the work of the Marquis de Custine, which appeared a few years ago, and which enjoyed much popularity at that time. The details of the author's family, which the original work included, have been wisely omitted, together with some other matters which are apart from its main subject. The object of the

publication has been to meet the demand of the day, and the whole work is therefore issued at once. It was originally published in three volumes, and though full of inconsistencies and contradictions, arguing on behalf of theories which the growing experience of mankind has discarded, evincing many of the exceptionable qualities of French authorship, and propounding dogmas better suited to the middle ages than to the present day, it throws much light on the institutions and social condition of Russia, and will amply repay the labor of perusal. There is a vivacity in its style, which, notwithstanding its occasional mawkishness of sentiment, renders its perusal a pleasure. Catholic unity, and a revival of the semi-feudal spirit of Louis XIV.'s reign, are the panacea to which the author looks for the salvation of Europe. We need not say that we have no faith in such remedies. But we must not now argue the matter. It is enough to indicate the character of the work, and to recommend such of our readers as have leisure, to examine its multifarious statements for themselves. The general view given of Russia may be learnt from the following sentence, which, coming from such a quarter, is sufficiently instructive:—'A monstrous compound of the petty refinements of Byzantium and the ferocity of the desert horde, a struggle between the etiquette of the Lower Empire and the savage virtues of Asia, have produced the mighty State which Europe now beholds, and the influence of which she will probably feel hereafter, without being able to understand its operation.'

-
1. *Great Truths in Little Stories; or, Drops of Wisdom for Childhood.* By Maria Goodluck.
 2. *Tales of a Large Family; or, Records of the Hive, the Nest, and the Bower.* By Maria Goodluck. London: Darton and Co.

WERE we disposed to be cynical, Dr. Elliotson's letter in the 'Times' of the 30th of last January, would effectually prevent our being so. Belonging to a race generally deemed captious, we venture to put in a bill of exception, and to claim at least some share in the kinder sympathies of the human heart. Two sisters, who have seen better days, are now, without fault of their own, 'in the depth of poverty, and to poverty is added sickness.' For some time past they have been endeavouring to maintain themselves by their literary abilities. The intellect of one has failed in the struggle, and the other, has sunk into sickness, and lost the use of a hand. Such is the condition of the author of these small volumes. We need say no more, but will add, in justice to Miss Goodluck, that her productions are distinguished by purity of sentiment, easy versification, and an admirable moral. The children of our families will be much pleased with her 'fables,' and such of us as are of maturer age, may gather from them both pleasure and instruction.

The Boatman of the Bosphorus. A Tale of Turkey. By the Osmanli Abderahman Effendi. In Three volumes. London: T. C. Newby.

UNDER any circumstances, these volumes would be entitled to attention, but in the circumstances of the day they are specially attractive, and can scarcely fail to be popular. To ourselves their interest is mainly derived from the light they throw on the character and habits of a people with whom we are now so closely connected. Their drapery is essentially Eastern. They exhibit the weaknesses and the strength, the bitter prejudices, and the many noble qualities of the Turkish mind, and will do more than graver works to remove misconceptions and to induce an intelligent and correct estimate of Turkish character and sympathies. The boatman, Hamet—the Jew, Zahroun, and his wife, Salome—Don Xavier de los Morenoues, and the gentle and loving Zarifa—the eventful history of their daughter—the varying fortunes and diversified character of the members of the Romanowski family—the Polish government of Duke Constantine—and the desperate effort of the Poles to achieve their national independence, are sketched with considerable ability and nice discrimination. We shall not attempt to abridge the tale. This would only be to mar the pleasure of perusal. Suffice it to say that the work has strong claims on public favor, and is perfectly free from all that is pernicious or even questionable in morals.

Facts Without Fiction. By the author of 'Thoughts upon Thought.' pp. 327. London: W. and F. G. Cash.

WE have read this little volume with very considerable pleasure. Indeed, it has rarely fallen to our lot to be so much interested in a work of this class. Having commenced its perusal we were constrained to go through it at a sitting, and now commend it to the early acquaintance of our readers. Religious biography is so frequently written in an inane and fictitious style, that we were not prepared for the treat which awaited us. Many works of this class repel by their dulness, or, at best, leave on our minds only the impression of ordinary facts narrated in a mediocre and uninviting style. 'The facts recorded in this work are strictly veritable, they are extracts from documents which have been placed in the hands of the writer.' Such is the assurance of the author, and his volume confirms it. The narrative is full of incidents, and many of its passages are written in a glowing and beautiful style. It is, moreover, pervaded by a healthful spirit, which improves while it interests the reader. We do not envy the sensibility or the piety of a reader who can throw it aside before the last page is gained.

Lectures on Female Scripture Characters. By William Jay. London: Hamilton, Adams and Co. 1854.

THESE lectures were delivered more than forty-eight years ago, and were prepared for publication by the venerable author after he had

retired from the pulpit; indeed the last sheet was passing through the press when he was called home by his Lord and Master. Apart from this circumstance, so touching in its associations, the volume is distinguished by the known characteristics of his thoughts and expressions, and needs no commendation of ours to make it acceptable to our readers. The selection is miscellaneous. There are three lectures on the 'Shunammite;' two on 'Mary Magdalene;' two on 'Hannah;' one on 'Anna, the Prophetess;' one on 'The Woman of Canaan;' one on 'The Woman who Anointed the Saviour's Head;' one on 'The Poor Widow;' one on 'The Penitent Sinner;' four on 'The Woman of Samaria;' and one on each of the following: 'Lydia,' 'Dorcas,' 'The Elect Lady,' 'The Deformed Daughter of Abraham,' 'Martha and Mary,' and 'Lot's Wife.' The author intimates in his preface that he had five lectures on 'The Mother of our Lord,' the notes of which were in so imperfect a state that he found it was 'too much for him to think of filling them up at that time.' Most of his readers will regret that he was unable to reproduce them; yet it is a fine thing to see a preacher, at the age of eighty-four, actually dying in the midst of his work, and leaving so precious a memorial of his sacred diligence in a calling to which he had consecrated nearly three-score years and ten! The volume is dedicated, with much good taste and ripe Christian sentiment, to the widowed Countess of Ducie.

Biblical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, in Continuation of the Work of Olshausen. By Dr. John H. A. Ebrard, Professor of Theology in the University of Erlangen. Translated from the German, by the Rev. John Fulton, A.M. pp. 630. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

DR. EBRARD rejects all the hypotheses which have been framed respecting the authorship of the epistle to the Hebrews, and gives it as his own opinion that it was written by Luke, under the general direction of Paul. The reason for this opinion appears to us more ingenious than solid. He regards the writer as aiming to prove from the nature and principal elements of the old covenant itself that the revelation and redemption through the Messiah, promised in the old covenant, is represented, even in the old covenant, as an absolute revelation, as sufficient in itself, by which the Old Testament types become superfluous? The composition itself is formally a treatise, rather than an epistle, designed for a limited circle of readers. The treatise is divided into five parts: I. The Son and the Angels; II. The Son and Moses; III. Christ and the High Priest; IV. The Mosaic Tabernacle and the Heavenly Sanctuary; V. The Laying Hold of the New Testament Salvation. The volume labours under the apparent disadvantage of not being accompanied with a new translation of the treatise or epistle. The reader is supposed to be familiar with the Greek text, and with the works of previous German commentators. To such students, the work is likely to be acceptable; but we apprehend that its usefulness to others will not be so great as the translator and the

publishers desire. At the same time the laborious expounder of the New Testament will find in it a scholarly exhibition of evangelical truth and many happy suggestions for the elucidation of this interesting portion of the Sacred Writings. We perceive nothing in the shape of preface or note to indicate the reason why Olshausen's name is connected with the volume, or what portion, if any, of its contents may have been contributed by him.

A Compendium of Ecclesiastical History. By Dr. John C. L. Gieseler, Consistorial Counsellor and Ordinary Professor of Theology in Göttingen. Fourth edition, revised and amended. Translated from the German, by the Rev. John Winstanley Hull, M.A. Vol. IV.

THE readers of Dr. Gieseler's former volumes will be glad to have the continuation of his compendium. The FOURTH DIVISION includes the period between the removal of the Papal Court of Avignon and that of the Council of Pisa, being a space of more than a century, in which the author condenses the history of the schism in the Roman Church, the moral and political relations of the national churches, the monastic orders, the state of theological sciences, and the religious condition both of clergy and people, the ecclesiastical tribunals, the heretical sects, the efforts for reform in Bohemia and in England, and the progress of Christianity and the hindrances to that progress, followed by useful appendices relating to the Greek and other Oriental Churches. Of the FIFTH DIVISION, only the first chapter is contained in this volume, where the Councils of Pisa, Constance, Basle, and Florence are glanced at in their bearing on the great controversy of the age—between the monarchical and the aristocratical system for governing the Church, with France on one side and Italy on the other. We presume that the general merits of Dr. Gieseler are too well known to require that we should do more than state that, as a compendium—which is all that it claims to be—it is of so much value for its clear outline, its quotations from original sources, and its reference to more copious works on each successive era, that we shall congratulate ourselves and the public on the completion of the translation.

Egypt and the Bible. Being an Inquiry into the Traces discernible in Holy Scripture of the Influence exerted on the Character of the Hebrews by their Residence in Egypt. By B. A. Irving, B.A., &c. Cambridge: Macmillan and Co.

THIS essay obtained the Norrisian Prize at the University of Cambridge in 1851. Its object is to show the Egyptian influence on the religious tenets—the moral laws and institutions—the civil and political arrangements—the general habits and customs, domestic institutions, literature, &c. of the Hebrew nation. 'One thing,' the author says, 'we must be permitted once for all to premise, that though a resemblance of the Hebrew to the Egyptian institutions, much greater than has yet been imagined could be discovered, still whoever found it would not justly come under such a censure as that of Witsius' (as dis-

honourable to our most holy religion). 'For we hold that the Pentateuch and the whole Mosaic dispensation would not be affected in its divine character, even if we imagine that in the grossest system of idolatry, there might still be some remains of a holier and purer faith, which identical reliques of true religion an Omniscient Being chose out, to the marked neglect of all that was false; that these he combined with other materials which obviously *have not an Egyptian origin*, and that He delivered to Moses a religion in its *precepts* and *morality* exactly suited to the nature of man, and consequently, as we conclude, composed by one who either formed our nature, or, to take the lowest position, knew our feelings as never man has yet known them. We affirm that it touches not the claim of the Pentateuch to a divine origin, whether we suppose this to be the case, or whether we imagine (an opinion by no means authorized by the Bible itself) that God, when he brought Israel from Egypt, formed for them *de novo*, a system of religion and a political constitution which had no connexion whatever with those of Egypt or of any other country; but that those points which were common, were derived either by the Egyptians from the Israelites, or were points of sound morality on which they had happened to stumble, as having their foundation in affections and motives common to mankind in general.'—pp. 5, 6.

The Bible: our Stumbling Block and our Strength. A Tract of the Times. London: Chapman. 1852.

A SUPERFICIAL and supercilious treatment of a profoundly grave theme, condensing within a few pages the fanciful objections to the Bible which occur in the writings of modern disbelievers. The leading idea of the writer is—that the Bible is a collection of *myths*, and that myths are a natural and necessary mode of presenting truth 'implanted by God in the soul of man for a divine purpose.' Whatever the intention of the author, we cannot speak of his production otherwise than as an ingenious attempt to mystify what is plain, in order to get rid of the Bible in its obvious and practical character as 'given by inspiration of God.'

Sunshine of Greystone. A Story for Girls. By E. J. May, Author of 'Louis' School Days.' London: Bimms and Goodwin.

WE like this book very much. The story is bright, the characters are varied and natural, and we believe it will be much liked, and do not a little good. The author has done well to write a companion to 'Louis' School Days,' which is, in several respects, an improvement on that admirable book for boys. This is a department of literature that deserves, as we believe it receives, the encouragement of those who are most wisely interested in the entertainment of the young, by means which do them lasting good.

The Mystery Unveiled; or Popery as its Dogmas and Pretensions appear in the Light of Reason, the Bible, and History. By the Rev. James Bell. pp. vi.—603. Edinburgh: Paton and Ritchie.

MR. BELL's object in this treatise is to bring to the tests mentioned in his title the theory and natural history of Popery, which he resolves into the two elements of *Idolatry* and *Formalism*. The usual heads of Worship—Papal Supremacy—Rule of Faith—Sacraments—Confession—Purgatory—Indulgences—Good Works—Celibacy—Convents—Jesuits—and the Moral Tendencies of Popery, as intolerant and persecuting, inimical to the spread of Christianity and general knowledge and virtue, and tending to social and political degradation and vassalage—are discussed clearly and conclusively, while charity towards the dupes of this portentous compound of mischiefs is earnestly inculcated.

On the Lessons in Proverbs. Five Lectures. Being the Substance of Lectures delivered to Young Men's Societies at Portsmouth and elsewhere. By Richard Chenevix Trench, B.D., &c. &c. London: J. W. Parker and Son.

MR. TRENCH has here opened ground which will be found worthy of large culture, both by himself and by other labourers. The learning, good sense, and healthful feeling of these lectures make them admirable models for this new order of public instruction. The book, like a proverb, has 'a sting, and honey, and a body small.' We very warmly recommend it as worthy of universal circulation.

The Hiding-place. By Dr. John Macfarlane, Author of the 'Night Lamp,' &c. London: James Nisbet and Co.

WE have read this volume with much pleasure. It has long been our impression that works of this order are a desideratum. We have volume after volume of history, and many of them most admirable—we have works on the Millennium; works on popery; works on infidelity; but very few heart-stirring, devout, experimental, and practical works in divinity. Who that has read the writings of Flavell and Baxter but feels that their works abound with a peculiar unction and pungency, strikingly adapted to awaken strong desires of exalted piety, and to exhibit the security and peace of its possession. This is the feeling which now requires to be cherished amongst professors of religion. The level of spirituality, in our day, is a very low one. Dr. Macfarlane's work reminds us greatly of the works both of Flavell and of Baxter; and well will it be for the churches when such efforts are duly appreciated, and such works extensively read. The aim of the author obviously is, to awaken conscience, strengthen faith, and animate divine love by exhibiting the fulness, safety, and glory of the gospel-refuge to the sinner, and by setting forth Christ as 'the 'hiding-place' in every form of Bible attraction, and heavenly excellence. We cordially rejoice to learn that a second edition is already called for, and sincerely wish that a volume so remarkably adapted to usefulness, may speedily pass through many more editions.

The Book of Nature. An Elementary Introduction to the Sciences of Physics, Astronomy, Chemistry, Mineralogy, Geology, Botany, Zoology and Physiology. By Friedrich Schoedler, Ph.D. Second edition. Translated from the sixth German edition, by Henry Medlock, F.C.S. London and Glasgow: R. Griffin and Co. pp. 617.

WE have in this volume a striking feature of the times. Formerly one who wished to commence scientific studies, found few works calculated to lighten the difficulties occurring in the outset. In the present instance, however, the student is led on by easy and gradual advances, and the main object kept in view is to show the intimate relation of the different departments of natural science.

In our observations of nature we first comprehend objects, and then the phenomena they manifest.

Thus our author gives two grand divisions. 1. The Science of Objects. 2. The Science of Phenomena. These are again subdivided.

The Science of Objects treats of: 1. Objects which are similar in mass, or Mineralogy. 2. Objects which are dissimilar in mass, and *without* voluntary motion, or Botany. 3. Objects which are dissimilar in mass, and endowed *with* voluntary motion, or Zoology.

The Science of Phenomena treats of: 1. Phenomena *without* change in the objects, or Physics. 2. Phenomena *with* change in the objects, or Chemistry. 3. Phenomena in animated objects, or Physiology.

We agree with the author that, for such as are of riper years, it is best to commence with the science of phenomena, which will give the fundamental knowledge required for a thorough comprehension of animal and vegetable life. But with the young, who more easily comprehend forms than phenomena, we should commence with the science of objects. A great deal depends upon the teacher, and the conclusion of the introductory remarks is quite true:—'All ways, then, tend to the same end; but he who would reach the end, must not avoid the way.'

The illustrations are excellent; and, altogether, the volume is one which is specially adapted for the purposes of tuition.

An Epitome of the Civil and Literary Chronology of Rome and Constantinople, from the death of Augustus to the death of Heraclius. By Henry Fynes Clinton, Esq., M.A., late Student of Christ Church. Edited by the Rev. C. J. Fynes Clinton, M.A. Oxford University Press.

MR. CLINTON has worthily completed his labours by this 'Epitome' of his 'Fasti Romani.' Scholars and historical students will welcome it as the latest and indeed posthumous gift of one of the most helpful of the original inquirers in their departments of human learning, which this country has produced. And general readers and the extensive class of those who 'pursue knowledge under difficulties,' will rejoice to receive in this single, well printed, and cheap volume, the quintessence of two thick and costly quartos, just as in the 'Epitome' of the 'Fasti Hellenici,' they had the substance of the three quartos upon the chronology of Greece. The pious hand of a brother has put the finishing

touch—and no more was left undone—to this concluding work of Mr. Clinton's series. In it, as in the earlier compendium, we observe that not only are the larger volumes condensed, but there are also additional facts and references, with disquisitions that present the author's latest views upon those knotty points on which, in all probability, there must always be differences of opinion amongst the learned.

The section entitled 'Scripture Chronology' has, in this respect, as well as intrinsically, great value; and in relation to one of the questions of the day the same may be said of that headed 'Testimonia Patrum.' The method pursued, too, is so unpretending, so completely Baconian, that the *study* of the book will reward those to whom the matters treated of are in themselves indifferent. And if further commendation to our readers be required, it may be found in the fact that Mr. Clinton's researches are the basis of all recent treatises upon the chronology of Greece and Rome, both in Europe and the United States. We heartily wish that many others would follow the example of Clinton, Layard, and Wilkinson, and themselves epitomize their great works: not only because the age calls for portable books, but because nothing beside can supply the desire for authentic instruction which actuates the 'poor scholars,' whose number is the natural result of the prodigious diffusion of literature and knowledge that characterizes the times in which we live.

Robert Hall: his Genius and his Writings. By J. P. Mursell. London: Arthur Hall and Co. 1854.

It is now more than twenty years since Mr. Hall was removed from this world, and the generation that knew him in the full efflorescence of his powers is fast passing away. It is not, therefore, a little delightful to be led back by his highly qualified successor in the pastorate at Leicester to a fresh contemplation of that magnificent character in all those phases which seem in hopeless contest for our preference—the intellectual, the literary, the moral, the spiritual, the man of genius, the companion, the Christian, and the preacher. Mr. Mursell is not the man who would be likely in accepting the duty to which he was called—that of delivering a lecture on the Genius and Writings of Hall—to waste the occasion in mere panegyric; and yet his performance must of necessity rather wear that aspect, just as there are some individuals whom nature has so richly endowed with personal charms that the painter cannot produce an accurate delineation of them without indulging the beholder with the enjoyment of beauty, as much as if that had been his only purpose. Mr. Mursell begins with an exposition of his view of genius generally, which, while it avoids the perhaps hopeless difficulty of rigid definition, appears to us equally felicitous and just. He describes it as an intensification of the mental faculties in general, but especially of the inventive and the æsthetical; and while he by no means denies to his subject the possession of the former in a high degree, he shows, as we think, his correct appreciation of Mr. Hall's structure of mind by ascribing to it the latter as its predominant

characteristic. An absolute equipoise of all the faculties would be inconsistent with the necessary limitations and imperfections of the human mind. And this distinction indicates perhaps the principal point at which the mind of that great man escaped that glorious but unnatural condition. Mr. Mursell's performance is a most worthy tribute to the genius of his illustrious predecessor. It is impregnated throughout with a spirit of genuine sympathy and almost absorbing homage. It abounds with nice distinction, and with bold, but correct, delineation, and sparkles throughout with passages of singular eloquence and beauty. To transcribe some of these would be a pleasure which we are reluctantly compelled to deny ourselves; but many of our readers will doubtless relieve themselves from disappointment by perusing the lecture: and those who were privileged to be occasionally hearers of Mr. Hall, and especially those who were honoured by his friendship, while being guided back by these pages to the choicest reminiscences of their lives, will be pleasingly reminded that stateliness of intellect and glowing eloquence have neither died with Mr. Hall nor even deserted that denomination of which he was the greatest ornament since the days of the Commonwealth. Having been so happy as to belong to at least one of the classes last indicated, it is with no common feelings that we thank Mr. Mursell for his masterly performance.

Political Economy Illustrated by Sacred History. By James Taylor, Author of 'The Money System of England from the Conquest,' &c. Seeleys. London: 1852.

THIS is a neatly printed little book, written by a person of piety and philanthropy. His intention, however, in publishing his lucubrations is probably clearer to himself than it will be to the majority of his readers. We do not wish to disparage the little volume; but we seriously ask the author if he is enthusiast enough to suppose that our political economists will search the Sacred Scriptures for instruction in forming wholesome monetary systems, due legal restrictions on banking, and in investing capital in the best manner? and if he thinks that they who thus seek it will obtain the information they desire? The Jews thought their Scriptures contained the *semina rerum* for all the sciences. Mr. Taylor is the first English writer with whom we are acquainted who finds in the Bible the occult principles of political economy. The book will be useful, however, to those persons who are ignorant of the rudiments of that science. The worthy author has occasional divergences from the subject properly in hand, one of which we subjoin, and in the latter clause of the sentence we agree perfectly with the writer:—

'For my own part, if a large body of Christian people think their real interests are likely to be better watched over by a Jew than by a Christian, I have no wish to dictate to them—nay, I should rather be disposed to unite with them in electing a sincere Jew in preference to an insincere Christian; but surely common decency requires that, before the British constitution is altered for the sake of admitting a rich Jew

into the House of Commons, some provision should be made to prevent the doors of that august assembly being shut against a poor Christian, for no other reason than for his want of wealth.'—p. 26.

1. *What is Conscience?* By Rev. W. Mason. London: Hodson.

THE author of this little volume is evidently an admirer and follower of 'the illustrious Swedenborg.' We have neither time nor space to discuss the merits or otherwise of the doctrines propounded by that superb mystic; and were both of these at our command, we should still refrain—reluctant to 'rush in where angels fear to tread.' Mr. Mason is evidently an earnest disciple of his faith—eager to promote the best interests of mankind—well acquainted with the dogmatical literature of the past age; and the volume is shrewdly and ably written.

2. *What is the Human Soul?* By Rev. W. Mason. London: Hodson.

'THE illustrious Swedenborg' is the grand referee in this book also, which its author regards as a hand-book on the particular subjects treated of. He has endeavoured to dissect the soul, to show the soul's free-will when in the body and when separated from it, to harmonize the divine foreknowledge with the soul's free-will, and to explain the state and condition of the soul in the life to come, of which, by the way, St. Paul wrote that 'we know only in part.' Possibly, Mr. Mason might extinguish us by rejoining that much has been learned since the days of that great apostle. If so, St. Paul has much to learn from the philosopher of Stockholm.

The Priest and the Huguenot; or, Persecution in the Age of Louis XV. From the French of Louis Felix Bungener. Published with the author's sanction. London: T. Nelson and Sons. Another and cheaper edition of a work which we recently introduced to the favorable notice of our readers. The type is too small for our eyes, but will better suit the young, while the diminished cost of the edition will render it acceptable to a large class.—*The Field and the Fold; or, a Popular Exposition of the Science of Agriculture.* By the Rev. Edwin Sydney, A.M. London: Religious Tract Society. A little volume, well answering to its title, and full of information both pleasing and instructive. It belongs to the *Monthly Series* of the Tract Society, and it well merits a place amongst its many excellent predecessors.—*Letters of the Madiai, and Visits to their Prison.* By the Misses Senhouse. London: James Nisbet and Co. A deeply interesting little volume, exhibiting a picture of papal persecution and of calm Christian endurance not frequently seen in our day. 'Amid the many conflicting statements that have been published respecting the prison treatment of the Madiai, it is well that we should have such a full and exact account from an authority which none can question.' The profits of the publication are to be devoted to the sufferers, and we hope it will have a very wide circulation.—*The Charities of*

London in 1852-3: presenting a Report of the Operations, Resources, and General Condition of Charitable and Religious Institutions of London. With an Introductory Analysis. By Sampson Low, jun. London: Sampson Low, and Son. An immense amount of information is condensed within the limits of this small volume, and we shall be glad to find that the editor is encouraged to continue his labors. As a first attempt the execution of the volume is highly creditable to Mr. Low.—*Diary and Letters of Madame D'Arblay.* Edited by her Niece. A New Edition. The second volume of a reprint which we announced in March, and in which much entertaining reading will be found, at a small cost.—*Whitaker's Educational Register, 1854, containing a list of the Universities in the United Kingdom, with various particulars concerning them; the Colleges connected with the Church of England, the Roman Catholics, and various Dissenting bodies; together with a complete list of the Foundation and Grammar Schools in England and Wales, with an account of the Scholarships and Exhibitions attached to them, &c. &c.* London: Joseph Whitaker. This is the fourth year of the publication of this *Register*, the general character of which is accurately expressed in the title page. It is a very useful book of reference, and as such we cordially recommend it.—*Memoirs of Thomas Chalmers, D.D., LL.D.* By his Son-in-law, the Rev. William Hanna, LL.D. Third Quarterly Part. Edinburgh: Thomas Constable and Co. The former *parts* of this cheap reprint were duly noticed at the time of their publication. We are glad to report the steady progress of the edition, which is admirably suited to the pecuniary capabilities of a large class.—*Working Women of the Last Half Century; the Lesson of their Lives.* By Clara Lucas Balfour. London: W. and F. G. Cash. A brief and instructive sketch of the labors of several eminent women who have devoted themselves to the social and religious improvement of their species. The increase of such laborers is amongst the most hopeful signs of our day.

Review of the Month.

THE POSTPONEMENT OF THE NEW REFORM BILL, of which we indicated in our last Number our confident anticipation, was made a *fait accompli* on the 11th ult. The decision of the Cabinet was announced by Lord Aberdeen in the House of Lords, and by Lord John Russell as leader of the House of Commons. We are firmly convinced that this result is not attributable to the apathy of ministers; and as little do we believe that the decisions of the Cabinet have been determined by the comparative silence of the country. The truth is that any ministry would now have enough to do to manage the foreign

relations and interests of the British empire. In addition to this they must of necessity take into their consideration the position, the conduct, and the relative strength of the various sections—for we can hardly designate them as parties—in the Legislature. The conservatives would of course oppose the measure. The members for those constituencies which the bill proposed to disfranchise, would naturally vote for its postponement, while all would feel the importance of unanimity at a time when the whole resources of the empire are required for the prosecution of a war, the proximate events of which are certain, while its issues are hidden in the future. The policy of the government has, we think, been frank and wise; they have not signified the abatement of one iota of their interest in the success of the bill or in their confidence of the wisdom of any of its provisions. They are simply coerced by circumstances. The position of Lord John Russell has been peculiarly painful. If, as a statesman, he has a *prestige*, it is derived from his unequalled acquaintance with the philosophy of the British Constitution and his advocacy of parliamentary reform. To forfeit this *prestige* would be to fall through into public oblivion, and even to incur universal derision as the obsequies of his political decease. We are not, therefore, surprised at the insuppressible emotion by which he was affected even to tears when, in withdrawing the Reform Bill, he contemplated the possibility of imputations not against his consistency in a particular instance, but against the whole tenour of his political career. His withdrawal of the measure and his exposition of the motives by which he was compelled to it, drew upon him the warmest plaudits and the highest expressions of respect from all parts of the house. Lord John for once stooped to conquer; but he is bound deeply to feel the reasons which actuated his supporters in converting a humiliation into a triumph. The sympathetic support of the liberal party burdens him with a new and weightier obligation, and, in the case both of himself and Lord Aberdeen, invests an ordinary political promise with the sacredness of a vow.

THE PROVISIONS OF THE SCOTCH EDUCATIONAL BILL are now before the public. Its general tendency is favorable to the free church of Scotland. But it is poisoned, as all such measures are, by the vacillating principle of our State-church system, so that it will be unacceptable to all parties. It will offend the kirk, the free church, and the dissenter; the kirk by taking from the presbytery the examination of the candidates for the office of schoolmaster and the supervision of the religious instruction; the free church by making grants to Roman Catholic and Unitarian schools, just as freely as to Presbyterian; and the Dissenters, by insisting upon and providing for the teaching of religion by Act of Parliament, and at the public expense. As a summary of the objections which may be urged on political grounds against the bill, we avail ourselves of the remarks of the '*Leeds Mercury*,' in which we recognise the hand of a man who, perhaps, of all others of the present day, is most profoundly conversant with the subject of popular education.

'This bill is intended to bring *the whole of the popular education of*

Scotland directly under the pay, inspection, and control of a Government Board. It does not, indeed, prohibit either public or private schools on an independent basis; but it gives such overpowering advantages to the schools connected with the government, that its practical operation would be to extinguish nearly all others. Now this cannot be done without a very great and undesirable *increase of government influence and patronage*. Most of the members of the Educational Board will be appointed by the government. All the inspectors will be appointed by the government. Every schoolmaster must receive his license to teach from government inspectors and a government Board; and on the same authorities he will be dependent for his annual salary, for the continuance of his employment, and for his retiring pension. Every school committee will have upon it several nominees of the government. The schools will be dependent upon government authorities, not indeed for their whole income, but for so large a part of it as will give those authorities the real control. At every stage of originating, establishing, and conducting schools, government officers must give their sanction to the plans and proceedings, the rules and regulations. No one can reflect on the powers and duties devolved upon the inspectors and the Board, without perceiving that *the paramount authority and effective rule are given to those government authorities*, and that neither schoolmasters nor school committees could stir a step without official sanction, or being liable to official check. Add to these things the influence of the Committee of Council on Education, through the means of the inspectors, over the pupil teachers and stipendary monitors, and over the candidates for normal schools and for Queen's scholarships: and it will be seen that *the entire machinery of popular education in all the towns and parishes of Scotland, will be moved by Government money and Government functionaries.*')

A DAY OF GENERAL FAST AND HUMILIATION has been observed as appointed by an Order in Council, in consequence of the state of war in which the nation is unhappily involved. On the innumerable evils of such a condition of things, political, commercial, social, and moral, it is unnecessary to descant. How far it might have been prevented by a different diplomatic course it is equally unnecessary to conjecture. The British empire is now committed to it, and it becomes us calmly and seriously to look in the face all the multiform evils it entails. The sacrifice of human life it is of course impossible to compute; instead of a relief of public burdens we must now expect their continuation and their increase; and should the arms of the allied powers be visited with defeat the consequences are too fearful to contemplate. In such an alarming conjuncture nothing can be more suitable than for this whole nation to humble itself under the mighty hand of God. We have great national sins to confess and deplore, and the entire church of Christ in these realms may most wisely seize this opportunity for a special humiliation and intercession. But without desiring to discourage a national observance which has the semblance of originating in a pious motive, we must express a deliberate opinion that it should have been originated from the Church, and not from the

State. The edict which bears the name of the Queen virtually emanates from the Privy Council, and, *de facto*, from the Prime Minister, and the Cabinet. What propriety there is in such a body of men ordaining a strictly religious observance it is difficult to conceive, inasmuch as, even on the supposition that they are all devout men, it would be hard to discover their right, under the charter of the Christian dispensation, to enact any special religious observance, and to initiate and stereotype the prayers of the church of Christ. This, we think, of itself, a conclusive objection against the Orders in Council, and we are not disposed to prosecute further the inquiry, whether those who signed those orders can be recognised by the Christian church as consistent disciples of the GREAT MASTER. One principle only we hold as indisputable; namely, that any such observances should originate with that Church which consists of faithful men, and not with a secular body, who, in part, or in whole, may be alien from that which alone deserves the name of the church; and all of whom, whether this be or be not the fact, are destitute of any legitimate title to legislate for its observances and its concerns. Even if Christians had no surer guide, the '*Procul este profani*,' of classic heathenism, might teach them the lesson at least of an ostensible religious purity.

THE WAR WITH RUSSIA has now been prosecuted to such a stage that some serious collision between the hostile forces will probably have occurred before these sheets are in the hands of our readers. Both French and English troops are concentrating on the southern seat of war, where, notwithstanding the vastly superior numerical force of the Russians, the Turkish arms have hitherto been victorious. In the Baltic, the combined fleets are sweeping the sea in numbers which threaten some momentous event so soon as the advancing season shall allow of their unimpeded operations. Already they have captured several prizes, which they have borne off to the harbour of Memel; and one taken nearer home, and brought into Portsmouth, has re-awakened in the inhabitants of that town, feelings which have slept since the days of Nelson. The Russian fleet is still sheltering beneath the guns of Cronstadt, but it is expected that Sir Charles Napier will not long leave them unmolested, take refuge where they may. The '*Moniteur*' states that the French navy has now embarked on different seas 56,000 sailors, and England has an equal force. In describing the departure of the French fleet for the Baltic from the port of Brest, the correspondent of the '*Moniteur*' says, 'Nothing can give you a just idea of the ardour and enthusiasm of the sailors and soldiers. Our crews are excellent, the troops intended for landing are superb, perfectly organized, and admirably exercised. France, thanks to the activity displayed by the Minister of Marine, possesses at this moment a naval force and a body of seamen worthy of her and of her power. For a long time the navy had not exhibited so great a development. It is fully equal to the noble mission which France accomplishes at this moment, and the glorious deeds that are in preparation.'

As far as the naval operations of the allied powers are concerned, there appears every reason for hope and confidence; but we confess we

look with some anxiety to the evidently-approaching collision between the land forces in the Turkish provinces. Here both the French and the English have been comparatively tardy in the despatch of troops, while the Russians, with greatly superior numbers, have been suffered to possess themselves of the best strategetical positions. The most imperfect preparations have been made for the reception of the allied troops, and that, too, in a country occupied by a disaffected population. There seems at least reason to fear that the Russians will have achieved some important successes before the allied armies are in a condition to offer effective aid.

Literary Intelligence.

Just Published.

Incidents of Travel in Central America, Chiapas, and Yucatan; by the late John Lloyd Stephens. With Numerous Engravings. Revised from the latest American Edition. By Frederick Catherwood.

Claudius Ptolemy and the Nile; or, an Enquiry into that Geographer's Real Merits and Speculative Errors; his Knowledge of Eastern Africa, and the Authenticity of the Mountains of the Moon. By William Desborough Cooley.

The Treasury Harmony of the Four Evangelists, in the Words of the Authorized Version, according to Greswell's 'Harmonia Evangelica.' Having Scripture Illustrations, Expository Notes from the most approved Commentators, &c. &c. Compiled by Robert Mimpriss. Two volumes in one.

The Comforter; or, Thoughts on the Influence of the Holy Spirit. By Rev. John Cumming, D.D., F.R.S.E.

Signs of the Times; The Moslem and his End, the Christian and his Hope. By Rev. John Cumming, D.D., F.R.S.E.

The Chinese; a Book for the Day. By the Rev. Thomas Phillips.

The West Indies before and since Slave Emancipation; Comprising the Windward and Leeward Islands' Military Command. By John Davy, M.D., F.R.S., &c.

The Revelation of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ Historically and Critically Interpreted. By the Rev. Philip Gell, M.A. Vol. I.

The Grand Contrast, God and Man, set forth in an Epitome of Holy Writ, with Reflections, and a Critical Examination of Mr. Newman's Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrines. By an Aged Layman.

Why Weepest Thou? or, The Cry from Ramah hushed by the Voice from Heaven. In Letters Memorial, Consolatory and Practical. A Manual for Bereaved Parents. By the Rev. John Macfarlane, LL.D.

John Penry, the Pilgrim Martyr, 1559-1593. By John Waddington.

Shrines of the Holy Land contested by the Russian and the Turk.

The Journal of Sacred Literature. New Series. Edited by the Rev. H. Burgess, LL.D., Ph. D. No. XI.

Statistical Tables of Population, Mortality, Food, and Clothing, &c. &c. &c. 1801 to 1851. Compiled from Parliamentary and other Authentic Documents. By J. G. Darton.

The Congregational Church at Wrentham, in Suffolk; its History and Biographies. By John Browne, B.A.

The War between Turkey and Russia. A Military Sketch. By A. Schimmelfenning.

The Ministry and Polity of the Christian Church, viewed in their Scriptural and Theological Aspects, and in Relation to Principles professed by the Wesleyan Methodists. By the Rev. Alfred Barrett.

The Theory of Grammar. By S. Griffith.

The Great Sacrifice: or, The Gospel According to Leviticus. By the Rev. John Cumming, D.D., F.R.S.E.

Arabic Reading Lessons, consisting of Extracts from the Koran and other Sources, Grammatically Analysed and Translated with the Elements of Arabic Grammar. By the Rev. N. Davis, F.R.S.S.A., and Mr. B. Davidson.

Jane Rutherford; or, The Miners' Strike. By a Friend of the People.

The Life and Labours of St. Augustine. A Historical Sketch. By Philip Schaff, D.D.

Nettleton and his Labours; being the Memoir of Dr. Nettleton. By Bennet Tyler, D.D. Remodelled in some parts with Occasional Notes, &c.; and an Introduction. By Rev. Andrew A. Bonar.

The Biography of Samson, Illustrated and Applied. By the Rev. John Bruce, D.D.

The Centenary Services of Bristol Tabernacle, held November 25th, 1853. Containing a Sermon by the Rev. J. A. James, &c.

Julian; or, The Close of an Era. By L. F. Bungener. Two Vols.

Voltaire and his Times. By L. F. Bungener.

Memoirs of the Court of Prussia. From the German of Dr. Edward Behsi. By Franz C. F. Demmler.

The Gauntlet of Freedom.

The French School. Part I. L'Echo de Paris. A Selection of Familiar Phrases, &c. With a Vocabulary. By Mons. Le Page.

Finishing Exercises in French Conversation: being a Key to L'Echo de Paris. By Mons. Le Page.

The First False Step. By James Cargill Guthrie.

Sermons, Chiefly Expository, Preached in the Cathedral Church of St. Andrew, Wells. By the Rev. Edgar Huxtable, M.A.

A Portraiture of the Late Rev. William Jay, of Bath: an Outline of his Mind, Character, and Pulpit Eloquence. With Notes of his Conversations, and an Estimate of his Writings and Usefulness. By Rev. Thomas Wallace.

Bibliotheca Sacra and American Biblical Repository. April, 1854.

Gerstäcker's Travels. Translated from the German of Frederick Gerstäcker.

Marcus Warland; or, The Long Moss Spring. A Tale of the South. By Caroline Lee Henty.

Biblical and Theological Gleanings: A Collection of Comments, Criticisms, and Remarks, explanatory or Illustrative of 2700 Passages in the Old and New Testaments. By William O'Neill.

Consecrated Heights; or, Scenes of Higher Manifestation. By the Rev. Robert Ferguson, LL.D., F.S.A.

The Nunnery Question. A Report of the Great Catholic Meeting, held at St. Martin's Hall, Long Acre, March 21, 1854. To which is added, The Catholic Declaration; with the List of Signatures.

Robert Hall: his Genius and Writings.